

# THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

---

VOL. XX.

OCTOBER, 1916.

No. 4.

---

## SENECA AND NERO.

### II.

In 62, Burrus died, and Seneca knew that the newer and coarser favorites (*Tac. Ann.*, 14, 52) were incessantly intriguing against him, charging particularly against him the enormous wealth he had amassed, the magnificence of his parks and villas, and that he disapproved of Nero's appearing in musical monologs and in horse-racing. The emperor was old enough, they urged, to dispense with his preceptor. Seneca requested permission to retire from public affairs. The emperor accepted his resignation, but refused to take back to himself the wealth which he had bestowed upon him who had been foremost in his affections (*praecipuus caritate*).

But three years were left to the brilliant Corduban, years which he largely spent far from the madding crowd and from the insincerities of a courtier's life. More than half of Seneca's extant prose writings, inclusive of his enquiries into physical phenomena (*Quaestiones Naturales*), were composed by the retired minister of state in these three years. He resided often on his estate near Nomentum, not far from Rome, or on the Gulf of Naples.

He was now indeed an old man, and was bent on living what little span there might be largely in company with his better self, and cheered by the company of his second wife, Paulina, a lady sprung from the aristocracy of Rome. The greater and better part of these readings must deal with the thinker and moralist, and largely be made up from his own

thoughts and utterances. Of these latter I beg to cite from. (*Epist. Moral.*, 26, 1 sqq.)

"I was just telling you that I was in sight of old age; I now fear that I have left old age behind me. A different term befits my years, assuredly befits my body. Since, indeed, old age is the term for a worn-out period of life, not a broken one, count me among the decrepit, and those who are touching the last things. Still I am rendering thanks to myself in your estimate. I do not feel in my mind the ravages of age, while I do feel them in my body. Only faults, and the agencies that serve faults, have aged; my soul is vigorous, and rejoices that it has not much in common with the body. A great part of the burden of itself it has laid down. It exults and challenges me to a debate about old age; it claims that old age is its flowering period. Let us believe it; let it avail itself of its advantage. It bids me reflect and examine what part of this calm and this simplicity of living I owe to philosophy, what to my time of life, and carefully to investigate what I cannot do, and what I do not wish to do; . . . for what a plaint is it, what disadvantage, if, whatever ought to terminate, has given out? The greatest discomfort it is, you say, to be lessened, to pass away, and, to speak exactly, to be dissolved. For not suddenly are we driven in and leveled; we are consumed bit by bit. . . . I certainly, as though the test were approaching and that the day had come, which is to pass a verdict on all my years, thus observe myself: A mere nothing, I say, as yet, is that which I have put forward either by acts or words. Slight and deceptive pledges of the soul are those and wrapped up in many coverings of mere glitter. Without fear, therefore, I shall arrange my being for that day, on which, after tortuous devices and varnishes have been removed, I am to sit in judgment on myself, whether I merely utter brave words, or really hold them as conviction, whether something has been merely a pretense and an acted part, whatever of contemptuous words I have flung forth against fortune. Away with the opinion which men have been entertaining of me! It is always one



of doubt and equally allotted to good or evil. Away with the pursuits followed all my life! Death is to pronounce judgment on you. So I say: discourses and conferences on letters and words gathered from the precepts of philosophers, and scholarly talk, do not display the real strength of the soul. Mere *words* are bold even for the most timid; what you have *done* will appear when you will lie in your last struggle. I accept the terms, I shrink not from the judgment." Elsewhere (*Ep.* 30, 3): "It is a great thing, this, and one which must be learned during a long period, when comes on the inevitable hour, to go away with a calm soul." Everywhere the deep conflict in the soul, which insists, or would gladly insist, on autonomy and sovereignty in the face of death, and maintain the scepter in the face of dissolution. How frank, too, the complete denial of value for all that the world holds dear, and the confession that all attainments and achievements are as nothing on the inevitable day!—Who is not reminded of the 90th Psalm by these reflections (*Ep.* 49, 2): "It is but now that I seem to have lost you. For what is not 'but now' if you recall things? It is but now that as a young person I sat at the feet of the philosopher Lotion. It is but now that I began to plead cases. It is but now that I ceased to be able to do so. Immense is the swiftness of time, which appears more when we look back. For it deceives those who are engrossed with pleasant things; so imperceptible is the passing of headlong flight. You ask the cause of this? Whatever time has gone by is in the same situation: it presents the same aspect, it is equally destroyed. Everything falls into the abyss." And he, indeed, had gained all that the world of men held dear and holds dear, fame, power, money, and for some years the real administration of the Mediterranean world.

It may interest us to pass from these reflections to the concrete details of the manner in which in his old age he spends his day (*Ep.* 83). "It is wholly divided between reclining and reading. Very little is betowed upon physical exercise; and on the score of this I am grateful to old age:

it costs me not much; when I have stirred a bit, I am tired. And this, indeed, is the end of training exercise even for the most vigorous of men. You ask me who my trainers are? The single Earinus does for me, a charming boy, as you know. But he will change. I am now looking for one of more tender age. He indeed says we have the same crisis, because we are both losing our teeth. But now I hardly keep up with him when he is running, and in a few days I shall not be able to do so. . . . From this, which is exhaustion rather than exercise, I descend into my cold bath; this, in my present estimation, I call not warm enough. I, the great believer in the cold water regimen, who was wont to greet my channel (in the villa) on the first day of January, who on the new year, as to read, write, say something, was wont to make a beginning by jumping into the Aqua Virgo, first shifted my camp to the Tiber, then to this throne, which, when I am particularly vigorous and everything good as I trust, the sun controls. There is not much left for me for the bath. Then some dry bread and a luncheon without a table, after which it is not even necessary to wash my hands. I sleep very little. You know my habits; my sleep is very short and with intervals. I am satisfied. Sometimes I really know that I have slept; sometimes I suppose so. Why, there the din of the circensian games interferes with my hearing! My ears are sharply struck by some kind of sudden and general shouting. Still these things do not upset my reflection nor interrupt it. The roar, indeed, I bear with complete patience. Many voices which commingle into one are for me like the noise of many waters, or when the gale lashes a forest, and the other sounds, which have no connection with intelligence."

How little the Roman religion, so called, figured in Seneca's life or in his soul we could even now freely assume. It was a body of ritual, of institutions, of anniversaries, which were closely bound up with the history and achievements of the commonwealth; nothing can be conceived that was more non-spiritual, more outward and external. When we consider



that St. Paul resided at Rome about the same time that Seneca composed his *Epistulae Morales*, we pause for many a reflection. One impressive truth seems to rise before our historical quest: The Roman ritual had no concern with conscience and eternal hopes; where Christianity was to enter in was not as a citadel held by a goodly host, but a vacuum, or a bleak cave, crossed and recrossed by many a dangling spider-web of Etruscan superstition; it was not, in any higher sense, any religion at all worthy of that name. Among the lost essays of Seneca there was one entitled *De Superstitione*, known to us mainly through St. Augustine (*De Civitate Dei* 6, 10). The great theologian readily felt, as to Seneca, the same contrast which we feel between the outward conduct of his life and his writings. In that composition, then, Seneca expounded the natural theology of his own Stoic sect and of other Greek philosophies, and contrasted these with some ritual institutions of early Rome: "What then? Do more true seem to you the dreams of T. Tatius or of Tullus Hostilius? A deity of the sewers Tatius dedicated as a goddess; Romulus established Picus and Tiberinus; Hostilius, Pavor and Pallor, the most repulsive of human emotions, one of which is the stirring of the frightened mind, the other, not even a disease of the body, but its complexion. Will you rather believe these to be divine powers, and receive them in heaven?" After referring to the noisome cult of Cybele, the Phrygian Earth-mother, with the self-emasculation of its votaries and its insane debauchery, all figuring as "religion," he turns with fearless satire to the foremost sanctuary of the imperial commonwealth, that of the Capitoline Jupiter, tutelary deity of Rome.

During his sojourn in Egypt Seneca had observed the annual mourning for the lost Osiris, soon followed by the ritual exultation due to his being found again. This had amused him, as it was all a fiction. "Still," Seneca proceeded in that treatise, "there was a definite time for that insanity; it is endurable to be out of one's wits once a year. I came into the Capitol; I will be ashamed of the imbecility displayed

to the world, what function the vain insanity imposes upon itself. One furnishes names to the god, another reports to Jupiter what time it is, another is bailiff to him, another the anointer, who with a vain movement with his arms counterfeits one who is anointing. There are those who dress the hair of Juno and Minerva; standing at a distance from the temple, not merely from the cult figure, they move their fingers in the manner of hair-dressers. There are women who hold a mirror; there are men who summon the gods to attend on their own bail-bonds; there are those who present written memoranda, and explain their case to them. A well-drilled chief actor, an old man, mere skin and bones, every day in the Capitol, went through a pantomime as though the gods took satisfaction in seeing one whom men had ceased to see; every kind of stage artist is loafing there, going through their performances for the benefit of the immortal gods. Even certain women sit in the Capitol who think Jupiter is enamored of them, and they are not even frightened by regard for Juno, a most wrathful being, if you will believe the poets." It was all institutional, and Seneca expresses his own attitude as that of purely civic conformity and tradition in these words: "All these things the sage will preserve as ordered by the laws, but not as welcome to the gods." "All that contemptible medley of gods which long superstition has gathered together in a long span of time we will so worship as to remember that their cult is more a matter of custom than of any vital concern." Augustine censures Seneca even for this minimal degree of outward conformity. We marvel how author and conformist and philosopher could dwell together in the same person.

In the same essay, indeed, Seneca, as a man of affairs, criticized also the Jews and their Sabbaths, whereby they lost the seventh part of their lives. Within a century or a little more, however, as we perceive from Dio Cassius, the custom of the week had imposed itself fairly upon all parts of the Mediterranean world. Seneca in that essay called the Jews "*sceleratissima gens*." We know that even in Horace's time



there were synagogs in Rome; if it was in the time of Claudius (who banished the Jews from Rome)<sup>1)</sup> or of Nero that Seneca wrote, we take notice of that sweeping and severe term of condemnation. The Christian religion came out of Palestine and specifically out of the holy city of Jerusalem; we have no reason for assuming not only that a mind like Seneca's knew much or cared much for the difference, if any, let alone the cosmopolitan mob which then, in the main, constituted the population of Rome, and more than half, perhaps, were slaves in a population at this time of Seneca and St. Paul, probably, some 1,600,000. The hatred of the Jews, I say, Seneca attests himself; how deeply he felt it we know not. But when St. Augustine, in his survey of Seneca's essay on Superstition goes further, I for my part cannot follow him. "He dared not," says the bishop of Hippo some 350 years later, "he dared not mention the Christians for good or evil." I personally greatly doubt whether the great man, in many ways the proudest man of the day, even knew or had heard the name of the Christians before the great conflagration of Rome and before the cruel persecution right in the capital, which blazoned their name through the empire. Of this in a later reading. The first church in Rome, to which St. Paul wrote his epistle, was, in part, composed of Jewish Christians, who, of course, were of the type that "abominates the idols" (Rom. 2, 22), the cult-figures: the very things over which the leader of Roman culture had poured out the vials of his scorn and satire, a polemic directed not so much against these fictions and figments as against the notion that such could be connected with any genuine religion. And when St. Paul came to Rome, probably in the spring of 61 A. D. by the Appian Way, and entered the city, passing under the arch of Drusus, he reported in the Praetorium, where Burrus then commanded in the last year of his life. We learn (Acts 28, 17) that three days after his arrival he presented his case to Jews resident in Rome, the

---

1) *Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit.* (Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25.)

leading men (τοῖς πρώτοις) of that communion. And when they, in their reserve and guarded answer to Paul, stated that this sect, *viz.*, that of the Christians, "everywhere experienced contradiction," it is obvious that this term of "everywhere" (πανταχοῦ) must be understood as meaning everywhere in the Jewish communion. No, to the mind of Seneca all, both Jews and Christians proper, must have appeared as one sect, one form of Palestinian superstition.

And this brings us to the fictitious correspondence of Seneca and Paul. Even a superficial examination of the literary style of these missives makes it unthinkable that either Paul or the famous Stoic had any part in their composition. Jerome is indeed inclined to accept them, but his knowledge of Seneca's genuine manner can have been but of the slightest in that case, or of Seneca's secular history. Jerome places Paul's martyrdom in 67. The wildest of these forged documents is Letter 12, which pretends to deal with the conflagration of 64 and the charge against the Christians, of whose innocence Seneca professes to be convinced, with hints at Nero, unnamed, and allusion to cruel autocrats of the past, such as Alexander of Macedon and Caligula. The forger, indeed, found these (quite correctly, too) as appearing quite freely as types of the cruel autocrats in Seneca's writings. Seneca already has learned the chief article of Christian salvation (*ut optimus quisque unum pro multis donatum est caput*). To expend any serious criticism, whether material or literary, on this piece of pious forgery cannot be my purpose in this place. There are some curious allusions that Poppaea Sabina (*Ep.* 5) was addicted to the Jewish cult, and was angry at Paul for converting Jews to Christianity. Poppaea, indeed, whom Tacitus (*Ann.* 13, 45) thus delineates: "Virtue was her outward demeanor, but wantonness the practise of her conduct; . . . with her reputation she had no mercy, between husbands and paramours she made no distinction; from whatever side profit was displayed, thither she was wont to transfer her appetites." Seneca is fully conversant with language and dogma of the



Christian faith; he writes of the "Holy Spirit in Paul and over Paul," and expresses the hope or trust that Nero has been stirred by Paul's ideas. Paul (*Ep.* 8) is well aware that Nero is "an admirer of our side." Seneca is to send a Latin phrase-book for Paul's use. Seneca tells Paul that he, Paul, is the peak of all the highest mountains, and it is sure that Paul must rejoice in the prospect that Seneca will be reckoned as nearest to him, nay, as his *alter ego*. Seneca tells Paul about the great fire, — but why go on; this correspondence is not merely a pious forgery, but a very silly and childish fabrication.

At this point it may be well to excerpt from Seneca some glimpses of the actual Rome of Seneca and St. Paul. For in Seneca, after all, there is a much more searching standard of judgment than in Pliny's letters, or in Juvenal's satires, or in Martial's epigrams. "How much more" (Seneca, *Provid.* 3, 13) "ought one to envy Socrates (who died of hemlock) than these people, who are served in bejeweled dishes, for whom the boy concubine, taught to submit to anything, a eunuch or something like it, dissolves the snow in a golden dish? Whatever these drink they throw up by vomit, tasting their own bile again. . . . Why enumerate details?" *De Ira*, 2, 8, 1: "When you see the Forum packed with a multitude, and the voting enclosures (*septa*) filled with the concourse of a teeming mass of men, and that Circus, in which the people displays the greatest part of itself: know this, that in that place there are as many faults as there are human beings. Among those of them whom you see garbed in the toga there is no peace; the one is led to the destruction of the other by a slight profit. None makes a living but by wronging the other. The prosperous one they hate; the unlucky one they despise. Their superior they are annoyed with, to their inferior they are an annoyance. By different appetites they are goaded on. All their desires aim at ruin, and this for a slight pleasure or booty. Not different from that in a training-school of gladiators is the life of those who live and fight with the same. It is an assemblage

of wild beasts, except that these are harmless to one another, and abstain from sinking their fangs in their own kind, while those satisfy their appetites by rending one another. But in this one point they differ from dumb beasts, that these are tame towards those who feed them, whereas the ravenous fury of the others feeds on those by whom it has been nourished." The indifference of the rich for the poor (*De Ira* 3, 35, 5): "They take umbrage at spots and stains and at silver that is not resplendent from polish, and at a basin of water that is not transparent from the bottom. These eyes, indeed, which have not patience with marble but of multicolored veins, and glistening with fresh polishing, who will not have a table but marked with varied streaks of surface, who in their own residence disdain to tread on a floor not more costly than gold, these, when outdoors, with complete complacency gaze upon rough and muddy lanes, and upon the greater part of those who meet them in squalid attire, the walls of tenement blocks crumbling, full of cracks and out of plumb. What else, then, is it which outdoors does not annoy them, yet troubles them at home, but that mental attitude which in that sphere is complacent and apathetic, but at home censorious and querulous?" Of the inconsistency of one who professes philosophy, and still pursues also wealth and fashion (*De Vita Beata* 17, 1): "Why do you talk more bravely than you live? Why do you speak in meek accents to your superior, and deem money a necessary equipment for yourself, and are troubled by a loss, and shed tears when you hear of the death of wife and friend, and pay attention to what people say, and feel pain at ungenerous remarks? Why is your country place more elegantly gotten up than natural need requires? Why do you not order your table in conformity to your moral precepts? Why is your furniture rather splendid? Why do they drink wine in your house older than you are yourself? Why is your meadow artistically laid out? Why are no trees spared on your place, except those destined for shade? Why does your wife wear in her ears the value of a rich mansion? Why is your body of slaves



garbed in costly dress? Why is it a fine art to serve at your table in your house, and why is your silver-plate not placed at random and as your mood is, but the service is arranged with expert skill, and there is some one who superintends the carving? And, if you please, why have you possessions beyond the sea? Why more than you know?" There is something of Seneca's own circumstances here as they were under Caligula, and before he was relegated to his Corsican exile. Stoic profession and fashionable prosperity, too. It is the antagonism between the finer and the inner voice of the soul and the pride of the world.

His exile in Corsica had been in good harmony with the simpler life of his stoic creed. When he had not long returned from that island, he became an inmate of the imperial court, and was surrounded once more by the fashionable luxury of Rome. "I like," he then wrote (*De Tranq.* 1, 6), "food which neither whole herds of slaves prepare nor look on when it is consumed, food not ordered many days in advance nor served by many hands, but readily provided, but simple, not brought from a great distance nor costly, nowhere apt to give out, neither oppressive to purse nor health, not destined to return by the way it entered. I like a plain attendant, a slave born in the house, heavy silver-plate of a father reared in the country, and a table not conspicuous by the motley effects of its stains, and not known to the community through many successions of fastidious owners, but placed for practical needs, which neither arrests the eyes of any guest, nor inflames them by envy." He adverts to those who, while mentally indolent, collect great libraries (*ib.* 9, 4): "To what end countless books and libraries, whose owner in all his life barely reads through the catalogs? The mass burdens him who desires to learn, it furnishes him no equipment, and it is much better to devote yourself to a small number of authors than to stray through many. . . . Faulty everywhere is that which is excessive. Why should you pardon a man who is collecting library cases of citrus wood and ivory, gathering together the works of unknown and indifferent authors, and yawning amid so many thousands of

scrolls whose outward fronts and titles are his chief delight? In the houses of the most indolent, therefore, you will see all the orations and histories of the world, pigeon-holes reared up to the very ceiling." Of the cosmopolitan population of Rome (*Helv.* 6, 2): "Do look at these teeming multitudes, for whom the dwellings of the vast city barely suffice. The greatest part of that crowd has no country of its own. From their municipal towns and colonies, from the whole world they have streamed together. Some, ambition has brought here; others, the necessity of public service; others, a mission imposed upon them; others, dissipation, seeking a suitable and rich place for their vices; others, their eagerness for liberal studies; others, the public shows. Some, friendship drew hither; others, their industry, which gained a freer object for displaying their merits. Some brought their body to sell, some their eloquence to sell. Every class of men hastened to the city, which affords great rewards both for virtues and vices." Of the delicacies brought from far away (*Helv.* 10, 2): "It is not necessary to fathom the depths of every sea, nor to burden the stomach with the slaughter of living beings, nor to pluck shell-fish from the furthestmost sea. May the gods and goddesses destroy those folk whose luxury goes beyond the limits of so jealous an empire! Beyond Phasis (in the Caucasus) they insist that there be caught what shall equip the ambitious restaurant, and they are not loath to get game-fowl from the Parthians, from whom we have not gotten the satisfaction of punishment. From everywhere they import everything known to their fastidious maw. What their throat, ruined by exquisite luxuries, barely admits is brought from the furthestmost Atlantic. They vomit in order to eat; they eat in order to vomit. And the feasts which they gather from the whole world they do not even deign to digest." Such sermonlike outbursts against the luxury of the times could be multiplied by citation from his moral essays. In such a world and in such a society there were famous, by contrast, certain types that illustrated the virtue of poverty, like the mendicant friars of later times. Such



a one was Demetrius the Cynic. Him Seneca in his last years kept, like a living sermon, about his person. His life and dress and witty repartee were much bruited about. He was an exponent of virtues which many admired, but few followed. Here, too, Rome was the heir of all that had gone before. "He is not a teacher of truth," said Seneca of him (*Ep.* 20, 9), "but a living witness of the same."

Of the ladies of fashionable society (*Benef.* 3, 16): "Is there any woman now who blushes when her husband puts her away, since certain distinguished and aristocratic ladies count their years not by the number of consuls, but by their husbands, and they get divorces for the sake of matrimony, and they wed for the sake of divorce? . . . Is there really any shame of adultery left, since matters have come to such a pass that no woman has a husband but to allure a paramour? Chastity is a proof of ugliness. What woman will you find so wretched, so mean, as to be satisfied with a single pair of paramours, unless she has allotted hours to one each?" Men who indulged habitually in unmentionable vices were known as such in the circles of the aristocracy, but do not seem to have suffered, or to have been ostracized, on that account. Such, *e. g.*, was Marcus Scaurus (*Benef.* 4, 31, 3), whom Emperor Caligula elevated to the consulate. Such a one was Hostius Quadra, whose bestial lusts lowered him indeed far below the beasts, and whose murderers, when he had been slain by his own slaves, Emperor Augustus declined to prosecute. (*Nat. Quaest.* 1, 16.) From many more sides could we look at Roman life and morals if there were time.

Seneca tells us of the awful penalties of slaves. (*De Ira* III, 3—6.) They were placed on wooden horses, so called, with sharp metal points entering the flesh of the suffering servitor. There was the cross; their bodies dug into the earth, upright, and the projecting part surrounded by fires; their limbs were torn, their foreheads branded with hot irons, and they were thrown to the wild beasts, to be devoured by them in the cages. Such was the rule in dealing with slaves who had escaped. Who

at this point can avoid thinking of St. Paul and Onesimos, the slave, whose spiritual father the apostle had become in his own bonds (Philemon 10), his "own flesh and blood" henceforth (τὰ ἐμὰ σπλάγχνα)? Here Christianity appears to us in its essential strength and glory, that is, not as a stage of social development, not as an achievement of human evolution, but as the power derived from God, which announces to men that supreme truth, spiritual equality and the kingdom of God, while maintaining and respecting the institutions of men.

Before leaving Rome as it then was, let us hear Seneca as he deals with the ruling class and the aristocracy of the capital.

It was at Baiae, on that Gulf of Paradise, where, since the time of Lucullus, the villas of the rich and great fringed the shore, the Newport and the Trouville of those times. Seneca's villa, too, could be seen there. But what does he say of the life carried on by the smart set? "To see them tipsy, strolling along the shores, and the revels of those out in their yachts, and the lakes resounding with the strains of their orchestras, the misdeeds which luxury, as though freed from the laws, not only commits, but flaunts,—what need, I say, to see these things?" (*Ep.* 51, 4.) "Do you think a Cato would ever have made his residence by the glistening sand in order to count the dissolute women sailing by, and so many kinds of cymbals painted in different colors, and roses floating on the lake, that he might listen to the abusive shouts of those singing in the night time?" (*Ib.* 12.) "Do not they live contrary to nature (*Ep.* 122, 8) who in winter time crave the rose, and through the soft aid of hot waters and by means of the suitable change of winterly sports rear the flowers of spring time? Whose forests waver in the breeze on the roofs and pinnacles of their palaces! . . . Do not they live contrary to nature who lay the foundations of their warm baths in the very sea, and who do not think they can comfortably swim unless their warm swimming pools are buffeted by the floods and storm? When they have established the principle of willing everything



contrary to the custom of nature, at least they desert her entirely. The day dawns, it is time to go to sleep. It is time for sleep; now let us be active, now let us take a turn in the avenues of our villas, now let us take luncheon. Now daylight is approaching; it is time for dinner."

It will always remain an impressive lesson how this man, the most gifted and brilliant of that generation, turned from it, and in a measure was a stranger among it. But the point has come in these readings when we should learn, by some systematic survey, what it was that made him differ and dissent from that world. In a word, let us learn from him, to some degree, what was the philosophy which furnished him buckler and spear in his hostility. For Seneca was, if not the last nor greatest, at least the most brilliant of the Roman Stoics. And this sect was indeed the most virile of the schools of ancient philosophy. And bound up with these tenets, we shall from time to time come upon passages which indeed we may consider as *suspiria* of the human soul in that quest for rest and freedom which cannot but receive at our hands a large measure at least of respect and, may I say, of spiritual sympathy.

And first we must take up that which is the dominant power and the sovereign for the soul and for the conduct of life. The Stoics call it Nature, or the Universe, or God (*Universum, Rerum Natura, Natura, Mundus, Deus*). When Seneca, and this but rarely, used the plural, "*gods*," we readily perceive that this is but a concession to popular and current phrase, and that the polytheism of the pagan world is to him nothing but a body of traditional fancies and legends. This philosophy, which, in the main, may be called a form of pantheism, is immanent in all his writings, and runs and circulates through them as the warm blood circulates through the human frame and furnishes to it heat and life. I must add that another term of the general conception is Providence. "It is superfluous for the moment" (*Prov.* 1, 2) "to point to the fact that so great a work [as the Universe] is maintained (*stare*) not without some guardian or other, and that this assemblage and movement, in different

directions, of the stars is not a matter of chance impulse, and that those things which chance (*casus*) sets in motion are often thrown into disorder and quickly collide, but that this speed without any collision moves forward in its course, leaving such a total of things on land and sea, so great a number of luminous bodies most brilliant and giving out their light in an ordered way, that this order is not one of straying matter nor of things which were joined together haphazard; they are suspended with so great a skill that the supremely heavy weight of the earth is poised unmoved, and gazes about itself on the flight of the speeding heaven. . . . Let me reconcile you with the gods, who are the best in dealing with the best. For the Universe (*Rerum Natura*) does not suffer it that its blessings (*bona*) should ever be harmful to the good. . . . Therefore, when you see that good men, and those pleasing to the gods, are toiling, are perspiring, are mounting by a steep ascent, while the evil are living in wantonness, and moving easily among pleasures, think that we are being delighted with the self-restraint of *sons*, the others with the license of domestic *slaves*; but the former are being constrained by a sterner discipline, while the boldness of the latter is fed. Let the same become clear to you about god: he tests, he hardens, he makes that one ready for himself."

An eternal sequence orders and foreordains all. (*Prov.* 5, 8.) "Why, therefore, are we indignant? Why do we complain? It is for this that we are organized. . . . It is a superb thing to be whirled away with the universe. Whatever it is that has bidden us so to live, so to die, by the same necessity it binds the gods also. . . . That very founder and ruler of all has indeed written the fates, but he follows them, too. It is *always* that he obeys, it is *once* that he has issued his commands."

Speaking of anger and man (*De Ira* 1, 5, 2): "Who, then, is more ignorant of the Universe than he who assigns to its best and most flawless creation [man] this savage and pernicious fault?"

The material universe in which we now dwell is destructible and will be destroyed. *Ad Marciam* 26, 6: "Nothing will



abide in the place in which it now abides; age will carry off and level everything. . . . And when the time shall come, when the Universe, about to renew itself, shall destroy itself, those elements will hew themselves by their own forces, and stars shall crash into stars; and when all substance will be on fire, whatever now gleams in an ordinary way will glow with one great fire. We also, the blessed souls, have gotten a lot of eternity, when it shall please god once more to execute those mighty tasks, when all things shall totter, — ourselves, a slight addition to the mighty collapse, will be changed into our ancient elements."

Whatever had a beginning has also an end (*Pol.* 1, 2): "There are certain forces, which threaten the world with destruction, and this Universe, which embraces all divine and human things, some day will scatter, and sink into chaos and ancient darkness." "The two things which are the most beautiful will follow us in whatever direction we shall turn, the common nature and our personal virtue. This was done, believe me, by him, whoever gave the Universe its form, whether he is god, powerful over all, or an immaterial reason, the creator of stupendous works, or a divine spirit pervading all greatest and least with equal energy: this, I say, was done in order that none but the most insignificant things should not be subject to the decision of another." (*Helv.* 8, 3.) We see here that notable and central doctrine of the school: While the material and organic world is subject to immutable and eternal laws, the will and conduct of man, too, under all circumstances, shall be determined by conformity with that Universe and divine reason, which absolutely decrees to man to choose the right, the wise, the pure, the just, in preference to the wrong, the foolish, the lustful, and to injustice.

Elsewhere he says (*Benef.* 4, 8, 2—3): "Therefore thou failest in thy contention, thou most ungrateful of mortals, in saying that thou owest nothing to god, but to nature; because neither is nature without god nor god without nature, but both is the same and differs not in function. If you were to say that

what you had received from Seneca you owed not to Annaeus or to Lucius, you would not change your creditor, but merely the name, since, whether you have his forename or name or surname, he would still be the same. Thus now call it Nature, Fate, Fortune—all are names of the same deity, using his power in different ways. And justice, goodness, foresight, bravery, sound economy, all boons for one and the same soul: whatever of these you have approved, it is the soul that you have approved of." "Nature devised us before she shaped us, nor are we so trivial a work that nature should have forgotten us." (*Benef.* 6, 23, 5.)

And the underlying pantheism of it all is set forth in these words of his last stage (*Prolog. N. Q.* 13. 14): "What is God? The mind of the Universe. What is God? All that you see, and all that you do not see. For thus alone his greatness is ascribed to him, than whom nothing greater can be conceived. If he alone is all, then he holds his own work both within himself and beyond himself. What difference is there between the nature of God and our own? Of ourselves the soul is the better part, in him there is no part outside of his soul. He is all reason, whereas so great an error sometimes holds possession of mortal man that men think this Universe, than which there exists nothing more fair nor better ordered nor more unvarying in design,—that men think it is a matter of chance and moving by accident, and therefore replete with disorder amid the lightning, clouds, and storms, and the other things by which the earth and the regions near to it are buffeted."

From this underlying conception let us turn more particularly to man, his life duty and conduct. For the Stoics claimed that they were, preeminently, the *virile* among the sects of the ancient world, that their aim was not merely academic, but action, deeds, and right living.

Like their chief rivals, the Epicureans, they promised happiness and tranquillity of the soul, imperturbable calm amid the storms of life and the strokes of fortune, but with a profound difference of methods and ideals. In their moral quest the



Stoics emphasized the contrast and conflict between Reason and the Passions, nay, we may say the Emotions. This, they claimed, was "living in harmony with Nature" (*secundum naturam vivere*) (κατὰ φύσιν ζῆν). We will always bear in mind the dominant and semireligious position of that "Nature" which infinitely transcended all the myths and legends and the naive anthropomorphism of Greece. But let us again listen to Seneca directly: "The highest good is a soul which looks down upon the fortuitous things, rejoicing in virtue; or the invincible strength of the soul, well acquainted with the world, unruffled in action, coupled with much refinement and concern for those with whom one associates. We may also define it thus, that we say a happy man is he who cultivates what is honorable, who has no boon or evil but a good soul or an evil soul; a happy man he who cultivates what is honorable, is content with virtues, one whom the fortuitous things neither cause to be elated nor crush, who knows no greater boon than that which he can give to himself, whose truest pleasure is the contempt of pleasures." (*Vit. Beat.* 4, 2.) It is that sovereign pride and self-sufficiency which, after all, marks the trenchant difference, nay, the chasm not to be bridged over, between Stoicism and Christianity. It is quite true, on the other hand, that in the general outlook upon the world that system presents many features which, if we will not admire, we may at least respect. There are certain aspects, undoubtedly, of their ethics which have at least a resemblance to Christianity. They presented boons in certain categories. Those, however, which the world then ranked higher, and does so even now, are greatly reduced in their valuation. These are wealth, beauty, public honors, pleasures of food and drink, nay, even life and death. All these are not boons proper, but *fortuita*, *indifferentia* (ἀδιάφορα). "You think," he writes (*Ep.* 23, 2), "I wish to take from you many pleasures, in removing the fortuitous things, in holding that hopes, the sweetest diversions, should be avoided? Nay, quite the opposite; I do not want joyousness ever to be lacking to you. I want it to spring at home from you; it is born if your home

is in your own consciousness. The other forms of cheer do not fill your breast. They do indeed smooth out the furrows on your forehead; they are trivial, however, unless perhaps, you think he is rejoicing who laughs. The soul should be, must be, alert and firm in its trust and rise above everything. Or do you think that any one despises death with a smooth mien, as they say, with a pretty cheerful one, as those *bon vivants* say? that (with cheerfulness) he opens his house to poverty? that he holds appetites in curb? that he strives to have patience for pain?" Or again: "The place which in this world God holds, this the soul is in man. What *matter* is there, that is the *body* in us. Let, then, the inferior be subject to the better. Let us be brave in confronting the fortuitous things. We must not shiver at injuries, at wounds, at prison, at poverty. What is death? Either an end or a passing to another state, and I am not afraid to cease to be, for it is the same as never to have begun. Nor [am I afraid] to pass over into a different state, because nowhere will I be in as narrow quarters as here." (*Ep.* 65, 24.) We may pass over his decrying wealth. His generation observed his vast accumulation of it, and was strongly inclined not to take some of his moral preaching very seriously. Even Tacitus, that delicate artist in psychological analysis, generally speaks of our philosopher with striking coolness and reserve.

### III.

Let us turn, therefore, at this point to the great topic of Death, which figures so largely in his writings. And is it not one of the towering concerns in all philosophies and all religions? We shall behold this topic to be inextricably intertwined with the Stoic axiom of freedom and with the latter's ultimate postulate, *viz.*, with suicide. "Death," he says (*Ep.* 82, 15), in a fine passage, reminding us not a little of the familiar soliloquy of Hamlet, "is not an adiaphoron or a neutral thing (as the question whether your hair is symmetrically arranged). Death is among those things which indeed are not evil, but have the appearance of an evil; it is the love of one's self, and the innate will to endure, and preserve oneself, and

the passionate reluctance from dissolution, because death seems to wrest many boons from us, and to lead us out of this resource of things to which we have become accustomed. This also estranges us from death, that we know these things now; and as to those other to which we are to pass over, we know not what they are, and we shrink from the unknown. Besides, there is a natural fear of darkness into which it is believed death is going to lead us. Therefore, even if death is an *adiaphoron*, it is not something that may be treated with neglect; by great training the soul must be hardened, in order that it may endure its sight and approach."

Suicide, I said, was a postulate and a logical sequence of the Stoic doctrine of freedom. Particularly so it was in the first century after Christ, when the Roman aristocracy was often sorely beset by the tyranny of their autocrats, and it was to some of them almost the only way left to combine a certain fame with the freedom of the olden time, to pass out of a life which for them no longer contained either freedom or fame. Speaking of the slavish condition of certain Oriental courtiers, moralizing about it all, (and it was before he became a courtier himself,) Seneca goes on to say (*De Ira* 3, 15, 3): "We will not find any consolation for so gloomy a slave-pen; we will not encourage any one to endure the commands of hangmen: we will point out in every form of slavery an open road to freedom. . . . Whithersoever you will direct your glance, there is an end of troubles. Do you see the precipitous place? There is a descent to freedom. Do you see that sea, that stream, that cistern? There freedom reposes at the bottom. Do you see that tree, low, shriveled, dead? Freedom grows on it. Do you see your throat, your heart? They are means of escape from slavery." Elsewhere, as an old man, he writes (*Ep.* 17, 9): "The sage will accommodate himself to nature. But if the uttermost has befallen, he will speedily pass out of life, and will cease to be an annoyance to himself." Or again (*Ep.* 58, 35): "I shall not forsake old age, if it will reserve me wholly to myself, wholly, I mean, on the score of the better part;



but if it shall begin to undermine my mental powers, to rudely shake its structure, if it will leave me not life, but mere vegetative existence, I shall leap forth out of the tumble-down and tottering structure." Socrates is praised for not anticipating the hemlock, but practically awaiting it for thirty days. (*Ep.* 70, 9.) Under all circumstances, he argues, the sage should anticipate a death decreed by a tyrant: "If one death is attended with torture, and the other is simple and easy, why should one not apply oneself to the latter? As I may choose a vessel when I am about to go on a voyage, and a house when about to choose a residence, so the form of death when about to pass from life. Besides, as a longer life is absolutely not the better life, so a more protracted death is absolutely the worse death. In nothing more than death ought we to humor our soul. Let him pass out (*exeat*) by that avenue by which he has the impulse to do so; whether he seeks the steel, or the rope, or some potion that takes possession of his veins, let him go forward and snap asunder the bonds of slavery." (*Ep.* 70, 11. 12.) As in many of the problems which confront the soul of man uncheered by any revelation, so our philosopher, too, is uncertain about immortality. He was here not without some impress and influence that came from Plato; so, consoling the lady Marcia at the death of her young son (*Marc.* 25, 1): "There is no reason, therefore, why you should hasten to the tomb of your son; the worst part of him, and the most troublesome to him, lies there, bones and ashes, no more real parts of him than garments and other coverings of bodies." Your father, Marcia, there clasps to his bosom his grandson, although there all are kin to all, and teaches him who rejoices in the new light, and teaches him the orbits of the neighboring constellations." But elsewhere he leaves it quite undecided (*Polyb.* 9, 2. 3): "If the deceased have no consciousness remaining, my brother has escaped all the troubles of life, and has been restored to that state in which he was before he was born; and, free from all troubles, he fears nothing, desires nothing, suffers nothing. . . . If, on the other hand, the deceased have perception, then my

brother's soul, as though let out of long imprisonment, at least in full control of himself, is in transports, and enjoys the sight of the universe."

But we must begin to conclude this survey of Seneca's thoughts, though in that generation they were clearly all that he had for beacon and consolation. There remains a side of these moral essays where the dignity or purity of his ideas certainly approaches Christianity, or reminds us of that which we hold so dear. So in placing the essence of wrong in the purpose and consciousness (*Const.* 7, 4): "One may commit a sin without having committed any. If one cohabit with his own wife in the belief she is another man's wife, he will be an adulterer, although she will not be an adulteress. . . . All crimes have been accomplished even before the execution of the deed, sufficiently to establish the guilt." Fiery coals: "Some one will be angry against you? Challenge him by acts of kindness." (*De Ira* 2, 34, 5.) "Why do I by soft phrases conceal the ulcer which is world-wide? We are all of us evil; whatever, therefore, will be censured in another each single one will discover in his own bosom." "Examine the entire attitude of your own mind; although you have done no evil, you *can* do it." (*De Ira* 3, 26, 4.) "A wise way to curb anger and to strive for peace and gentleness is to think deeply of our mortality." (*De Ira* 3, 42, 2.) "To obey God is freedom." (*Vita Beat.* 15, 7.) "Not even the bitterness which you direct against others . . . will hinder me from persisting in praising not the life which I lead, but that which I know I ought to lead, will prevent me from following virtue even at a great distance, crawling." (*Ib.* 18, 2.) "When we have driven out the covetousness for what is another's, out of which arises all the evil of the soul." (*Clem.* 2, 1, 4.) "God also" (*Benef.* 4, 28, 3) "gives certain gifts to the entire human race from which none are excluded. For it was not possible that the wind should be favorable to the good and adverse to the wicked, . . . nor could a law be given to the rain-showers that were to fall that they should not fall on the lands of the evil and wicked." We will

close with an impressive testimony of the soul as to the uniform prevalence of sin and evil in mankind: "Moral faults do not wait in one place; but nimble and separating they raise an uproar. They rout one another and are routed. But the same judgment we will always be compelled to utter, that evil we are, evil we have been, and, unwillingly I will add it, that evil we shall be."

Turn we now from this survey of philosophy, precept, and ideals to the last years of Nero's tutor and minister.

Probably nowhere in the entire extent of the Roman Empire was there any one whose life and whose striving was in more complete contrast with Seneca than his imperial pupil, patron, sovereign.

What was Nero? What was in his innermost soul? We often say, If we could but fathom the soul of such and such a one! In the case of this ruler that word would be quite inept and unmeaning. For his soul had no depths whatever; shallow and superficial in its very structure, it became more and more impervious to the monition of what conscience there was in him. He was convinced that he had in himself the endowment of a great musical artist. His voice was thin and poor, but no matter. He entered into training with earnest devotion, and omitted nothing observed and practised by professional vocalists, *e. g.*, to lie on his back with a leaden plate on his chest, to purge in all the ways known to nature, to regulate his diet. He knew that his will was the supreme power in his world, and he was unable to see anything to furnish a motive other than the gratification of this shallow ambition. His first appearances before a whole community was at Naples, because it was a Greek city. More than 5,000 strong young men of the lower classes were organized as *claqueurs*, who were regularly drilled in the various forms of applause. (*Suet.* 20.) At his first appearance before a general Roman audience he appeared in the role of Niobe (we may assume a Greek text), his musical character monologs lasting to 4 P.M. Of his appearance as a charioteer with race-horses I will not go into detail. In the



imperial collection of ancient coins at Vienna there are some on which Nero strides as Apollo Citharoedus. Here, too, he is presented with the crown of rays, as though he were a scion of Helios. He emphasized thus, perhaps quite consciously, his freedom, *viz.*, his freedom from his mother. There is a coin with the inscription *Libertas*, and a head of the genius of Freedom on the reverse. When Burrus died, in 62, he was followed by Tigellinus. Seneca and Burrus had been appointed for state reasons. The new favorite was given this great place purely because he was really an affinity of the shallow and superficial autocrat, and because he knew how to present himself as a ubiquitous shield of Nero's personal safety. After having figured in Caligula's time as a lover of that emperor's sisters (Mayor on *Juvenal*, III, 155), he had been exiled. Inheriting a fortune, and permitted to return to Italy, he had bought large pasture lands in Calabria and Apulia, where he bred race-horses, and this very thing was a link in the series of matters which made him Nero's chief adviser. As such he established a vast system of espionage, when every utterance that could be interpreted as unfriendly to Nero could be converted into matter for a trial for treason. He induced Nero to assassinate two Romans related to the Julio-Claudian dynasty, although they were living in quiet privacy. Clearly they were presented to the imperial jockey and opera singer as possible future heads of movements to unseat and destroy him. Tigellinus thus came to figure in Nero's valuation as the guardian of his throne. Such fears were now steadily lurking in Nero's heart. (*Tacitus, Annal.* 14, 57.)

But let us pass on to the momentous year of 64. More and more, as time went on, Nero was tempted to direct his sovereign power to do things that never had been done before, and incidentally to reveal the real Nero more and more. He had at first in that year (*Tacitus*, 15, 56) given out that he planned a tour of the eastern provinces. Superstitious fears, however, had made him pause, and the multitudes of the lower class at Rome, if we accept Tacitus's version, had been disturbed

by this project. Senate and aristocracy, however, were not so sure as to their grieving at this temporary separation. Whatever that may have been, the emperor (perhaps advised here by Tigellinus) determined to show his Romans that nowhere was he more happy to be than among them. The Neronian way of making known this sentiment is thus related by Tacitus (*Annal.* 15, 37): "He himself, in order to have every one believe that nowhere he was as happy [as in Rome] arranged banquets under the open sky, and used the entire city as though it were a single house; and more cited than all the rest were the feasts which Tigellinus arranged, more cited as to being noteworthy and superb, which I shall tell of as a type, lest I may have to tell of the same lavish profusion over and over again. In the pond of Agrippa then he [Tigellinus] built a raft, which was the scene of the banquet, which raft was to be moved by other ships acting as tugs. Barges, tricked out with gold and ivory, and as oarsmen male concubines, according to their ages and their knowledge of wantonness, were provided. Fowl and game from every land, and sea-fish, he had sent for all the way from the Atlantic. On the margin of the basin brothels were erected, filled with women of distinguished aristocratic society, and on the other bank appeared harlots stark naked. Further there were gestures and dances of grossly immoral nature, and when darkness came on, all the grove close by and the houses around resounded with music and were brilliantly lighted. Nero himself, stained with permissible and impermissible debauchery, had left no form of shamelessness untried, to have his conduct even sink to lower depths but this. A few days later he went through the forms prescribed for wedding with one of that band of boy concubines; his name was Pythagoras. The emperor assumed the fire-colored robe, and auspices were taken. There were dowry and the conjugal couch and nuptial torches, and everything was disposed to the gaze, which even in the case of a woman night covers with its veil." The stern and serious Tacitus certainly did not invent or exaggerate these things. The report of Dio Cassius (*Ep.* 62, 15) is dis-

tinctly independent of Tacitus, and probably reproduces the concrete actuality with even greater precision: "As master of the feast Tigellinus had been appointed, and every kind of preparation had been made in abundance, and it had been arranged in this way: in the center and on the water both the large wooden structures for the wine-supply had been set up free for all, and upon them cross-beams were fastened, and round about taverns and booths had been erected, so that Nero and Tigellinus and their fellow-banqueters, occupying the center, feasted on purple rugs and on dainty spreads, and all the others enjoyed themselves in the booths. And they entered into the brothels, and carnally mingled with all the women promiscuously who sat there; and they were the most beautiful and socially distinguished, slaves and free, courtesans, virgins, married wives of certain men, not only those of plebeian rank, but even the most aristocratic maidens and matrons. And every one who wished to had the permission to have what woman he wished, for these had no permission to refuse any." We shrink from citing further; the accounts illumine and confirm one another in the most convincing manner. A Neronian feast—Neronian ideals of life. A Seneca once the chief adviser of Agrippina's son, now a Tigellinus; the latter a true affinity, and one who brought out all that was worst in Nero. Nero, then in his twenty-seventh year, had indeed achieved a sovereignty in which the last remnant of good was trampled under foot. Neros would abound among men if irresponsible power such as his and the uncurbed fancies of the lowest appetites, coupled together in one person, were multiplied on our groaning earth.

Not so long after this there broke out the great fire at Rome. Tacitus, whose relation is the earliest we have (15 *Ann.* 38—41), leaves it uncertain whether the origin of that calamity was due to accident or to the wiles of Nero. At all events, it was the severest visitation through fire known to the annals of the Eternal City. It began in that part of the Circus which lay near Palatine and Caelius; it broke out in those shops which



dealt with fuel and inflammable materials, was fanned into a fury by a strong gale, and speedily enwrapped the great oblong of the Circus Maximus. Here there were no party walls or other impediment. It spread first to the higher points of the city and then again to the lower levels, where an intricate network of narrow lanes made impossible the work of extinguishing and checking the flames. The mere saving of life and body from the labyrinth of fire was desperately difficult. Some camped in the open country, some perished in the attempt to find and recover their own. The odd thing was that men abounded who boldly opposed those who tried to put out the flames; others hurled firebrands, shouting that they had orders from a person who stood high. Not even the plateau of the Palatine (and with it the chief residential buildings of the court) could be saved; for Nero was at Antium, by the sea, and did not come to Rome until the flames seized upon his own palace. Then he came, but it was in vain. Asylums were furnished to the houseless fugitives on Campus Martius, in the Pantheon, and other monumental structures situated in the west and the northwest sections of Rome. Nero threw open his parks, and even provided temporary shelter. Supplies were brought in from Ostia and other near-by places; grain was given out for a nominal price. Still the moral effect of these measures was not productive of good, because the rumor had spread that, while Rome was burning, Nero had mounted a domestic stage and chanted the Fall of Troy, comparing the present calamity with that classic catastrophe. On the sixth day only the fire was checked in the lowest part of the Esquilian district. The measure which proved effective was the demolition of buildings over a very great surface, which deprived the fire of an object.

But in other sections the fire resumed its fury, and particularly in this postlude of the long-drawn-out catastrophe temples, porticoes, and many historical mansions of the aristocracy were destroyed. The second conflagration much more was made subject of unfavorable comment, because Nero had

hurried forth from the *Praedia Aemiliana* (blocks of houses), now belonging to Tigellinus, and to Nero was ascribed the ambition of founding a new and finer capital to be called after himself. Of the fourteen *Regiones* (or wards) of Rome but four remained untouched; three of the ten were utterly leveled to the ground.

Suetonius, who published his *Twelve Caesars* about 120 A. D., some 56 years after the event, makes Nero (c. 38) directly responsible. Nero was, or affected to be, displeased with the ugliness of the old buildings and with the crooked windings of the streets, and so he himself had the city set on fire, and this with so little concealment that some consulars did not dare to lay hands on certain of Nero's footmen, who were caught with tow (*stuppa*) and pitch pine torches in real estate belonging to the emperor, and certain granaries near the *Domus Aurea* of Nero, whose room he greatly desired, were actually shattered with catapults and set on fire. The conflagration raged for six days and seven nights, the poulace being driven to seek shelter in public memorial structures and mausoleums. Apart from an immense number of blocks of tenements (*insulae*) and mansions (*aedes*), the residences of ancient generals, still adorned with the spoils of the enemy, were consumed, also the temples dedicated to the kings and later as memorials of the Punic and Gallic wars, in fact, points of historical association with the classic past of republican greatness. This conflagration he viewed from the Tower of Maecenas (on the edge of the Esquiline), and, charmed with the esthetical effect of the sheet of fire as he himself expressed it, he chanted completely (*decantavit*) the taking of Troy. Dio Cassius (62, 16—18) is even more rancorous than Suetonius, who preserves the calm of the delving antiquarian even when recounting the most harrowing details. Dio even, in his hurry, places Nero on the highest point of the Palatine (instead of on Maecenas's tower), where there was the best panoramic view of the burning sections, when he, in his citharoedic robe, sang the fall of Troy, as he himself said, but as he was seen to do, that of Rome.

But the entire Palatine Hill was itself burned over, as Dio himself says. It was indeed very close to the Circus Maximus; we cannot, then, fairly, charge Nero with the responsibility for the great disaster. But for all that he was blamed for it by the sentiment and the utterances of the day. There seemed to be, in the view of his own generation, an inherent probability and plausibility to lay it at his door. His fondness for the enormous, the striking, and the wildly extraordinary was familiar to every mind. An inscription in Orelli (No. 736) of Region XI deals with the event, and would seem to be the earliest record and document of the disaster.

Ex voto suscepto, quod diu erat neglectum nec redditum, incendiorum arcendorum causa quando urbs per novem dies (*sic*) arsit, Neronianis temporibus—providing also a *litatio* by certain magistrates on August 23d of every year, in honor of the God of Fire, on the *Vulcanalia*.

Great were the improvements observed in the rebuilding of Rome, with streets wider and straighter: the sheltering of *insulae* with porticoes, the use of fire-proof stone in certain portions, bounties for speed in rebuilding, a more generous supply of water from the aqueducts, ready means for fighting fires. And still the rumor would not down that Nero was responsible. And so, probably advised by Tigellinus, he turned the public anger against those persons whom the common people called Christians, hated as Tacitus (*Annal.* 15, 44) says, on account of their shameless deeds. "The originator of that name, Christus, had been executed in the reign of Tiberius through the procurator Pontius Pilate, and the pernicious superstition, checked for the moment, broke out again, not only in Judea, the source of that evil, but even in the capital, into which from everywhere awful and shameful things flow together and are observed in worship. Therefore there were first seized those who confessed; then, through their informing, a vast number was found guilty, not so much in the judicial investigation of the conflagration as in the hatred which they entertained for mankind." Little doubt that they had lived in the conviction of the sinfulness and wickedness of the world surging about



them, and expected the speedy coming of our Lord and His judgment. I proceed with the words of the Roman historian: "And as they were being executed, forms of sport were brought into play to have them perish covered with the pelts of game, and so mangled by dogs, or pinned to crosses, or to be burned alive, and when the day was done, burned so as to illumine the night. Nero had offered his own parks [where now St. Peter's Place is], and presented sports of horse-races, mingling with the mob in the garb of a charioteer, or standing upon a chariot. Hence, although they were wretches, and had deserved the most exquisite penalties, pity for them arose, as though they were done away with, not for the common good" (as Tacitus estimates they deserved, as a kind of plague), "but to serve the cruelty of a single person." Suetonius, writing a few years later than Tacitus (*Nero* 16): "The Christians were executed, a class of men attached to a new and pernicious superstition." Of the same generation as these prose writers was the poet Juvenal (*Sat.* 1, 155). As he intimates, Tigellinus, the emperor's favorite counselor, had been charged with the fire.

Pone Tigellinum: taeda lucebis in illa  
qua stantes ardent, qui fixo pectore fumant  
et latum media sulcum deducit harena.

A long row of martyrs were buried to their middle in the sand and so burned. The very variety of these cruel illuminations by human tapers constituted that cruel sport to which Tacitus alludes. Here, too, it is most likely (Jerome's chronology seems faulty) that there perished the great apostle of the Gentiles. He had at one time (*Phil.* 1, 26) expected to regain his freedom. Timothy had come to him and had returned to the East. Paul's particular sojourn and perhaps also the particular sphere of his preaching had been in the praetorian barracks (*Phil.* 1, 13). There had been those, perhaps Jews, who spoke of Christ largely to turn public attention against Paul. The current conception of that communion by the pagan world, as we see, was atrociously untrue. Second Timothy seems to be the last document of Paul's life and faith (2 *Tim.* 2, 4. 6).

There are two schools of interpretation in dealing with the Revelation of St. John the Divine, the one with Irenaeus, placing it in the time of Domitian, while the other connects it with these Neronian times: Rome, on her seven hills, the unspeakable wantonness rampant under Nero, the conflagration, and the martyrdom of the Roman Christians, and 666 (Apoc. 13, 18) as the veiled designation of Nero himself, the Beast. The consonants in "Neron Kaisar" by Hebrew numerical symbols (as Benary showed, and as a Talmud scholar recently worked out for me) total 666. And it is right at the central abode of the crimson harlot, Apoc. 17, 6: "And I saw the woman drunken from the blood of the saints and from the blood of the witnesses of Jesus." Cf. Apoc. 17, 8: "The Beast that was, and is not, and will come again," with which compare Suetonius, *Nero* 57: "Et tamen non defuerunt, qui per longum tempus vernis aestivisque floribus tumulum eius ornarent, ac modo imagines praetextatas in rostris proferrent quasi viventis et brevi magno inimicorum malo reversuri."<sup>2</sup>)

2) It is not easy to define in detail the fulfilment of the visions and prophetic sayings in the Apocalypse. Against the numerical symbolism which the author favors for the interpretation of chap. 13, 18 the reasons of Dr. Salmon (*Introduction to the N. T.*, pp. 291 ff.) still stand. He argues "that Nero could not have been intended, because 1) the prophecy in that case would have been immediately falsified; 2) the solution would have been known to the early Christians; but it was *not* known according to Irenaeus." Dr. Salmon then adds (p. 300): "Pages might be filled with a list of persons whose names have been proposed as solutions of the problem. Among the persons supposed to be indicated are the emperors Caligula, Trajan, and Julian the Apostate, Genseric the Vandal, Popes Benedict IX and Paul V, Mahomet, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Beza, and Napoleon Bonaparte. There are three rules by the help of which I believe an ingenuous man could find the required sum in any given name. First, if the proper name by itself will not yield it, add a title; secondly, if the sum cannot be found in Greek, try Hebrew, or even Latin; thirdly, do not be particular about the spelling." One example which he gives elsewhere, not, of course, seriously, is amusing, particularly if vv. 16. 17 be borne in mind. It is  $\pi\alpha\rho\rho\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  ( $\pi = 80 + \alpha = 1 + \rho = 100 + \epsilon = 100 + \nu = 50 + \epsilon = 5 + \lambda = 30 + \lambda = 30 + \omicron = 70 + \varsigma = 200$ ; total = 666). (Plummer, in *Pulp. Comm.*, *ad loc.*) Luther assigns the entire book of Revelation to the third class of prophecies, "those without words and interpretations, exhibited by means of mere emblems and figures."

IN 65 A. D. occurred the conspiracy of Piso, which was intended to relieve Rome and the world of Nero. Gaius Piso was a scion of the noble house of the Calpurnii; he counted among his ancestors very many of those men who had made Rome's greatness in the past. He was a pleader of eminent ability also (Tac., *Ann.* 15, 48), affable in speech and social contact; he was favored with a stately presence and noble features; as for the rest, he was of easy morals and fond of pleasure. The movement to place him on the throne in place of Nero was very popular, and consequently the number of those who took share in the plot was so great that Tacitus was unable to name any individual as the real originator of the conspiracy. Some officers of the Praetorian Guards were eminent for determination and perseverance in the enterprise. One of the conspirators was that brilliant young man of letters, the poet Lucan, a son of Seneca's brother, Mela. The most important accomplice was Faenius Rufus, who shared with Tigellinus the chief command of the Praetorians. Tigellinus had long intrigued against this colleague of his, charging that he had been a paramour of Agrippina, and was plotting revenge for her death. The inception for the Pisonian conspiracy, by the bye, antedated the great fire.

Finally, the date of the annual games of Ceres, the Cerelia (April 25), were chosen as the time for action. Piso himself was to await the issue in the temple of Ceres. But the freedman of the man who was to deliver the decisive stroke weakened. His wife urged him to secure for himself the immense reward, which, if he acted promptly, he need not share with any other

---

Of this class of prophecies he holds: "As long as they remain uninterpreted and no reliable interpretation is offered, they are hidden and mute prophecies, and have not reached the point where they may be of that use and benefit to Christians for which they were intended." He offers his own opinion on the meaning of the strange events which John has recorded, however, without any claim to absolute certainty. He holds that in the 13th chapter the activity of the seventh angel, the third woe, signifies papal imperialism or the imperial papacy. "Here the papacy also secures secular power, and proceeds to dominate men, not with the Book, as in the second woe, but with the sword." D.



informer. Thus his master was promptly arrested and still another was brought in. The prospect of torture unsealed their lips. Thus Piso was named, thus Seneca himself was named; his nephew Lucan, who even named his own mother, to gain mercy. Then followed the tortures and the superb firmness of the woman Epicharis and her death. The number of names swelled like a flood. In vain Piso was urged to rise openly and appeal to Rome and the moral support of men's minds; he returned to his mansion, and died by opening his veins.

And now we are to tell, largely from Tacitus, the end of the man to whom in great measure these readings have been devoted. But before we present this account, an important element in his philosophy and his ideals should, however succinctly, be presented, *viz.*, the sage and his attitude towards autocratic rule and autocrats. Nowhere so strongly as here is the essence revealed of that curious blending of lofty precepts and sovereign pride which is so characteristic of the Stoic School, and in which its deepest difference from Christianity and from Seneca's contemporary St. Paul stands revealed.

"Never yet did that perfect man who has attained moral excellence abuse fortune. Never did he meet things that befell him in a gloomy mood. Believing himself a citizen of the Universe and a warrior, he underwent hardships as though these were imposed upon him by orders. Whatever befell him he did not spurn as an evil, and which had struck him by chance, but as entrusted to him." (*Ep.* 120, 12.) "The sage maintains his stand as a neighbor and as nearest to the gods, apart from his mortality resembling the deity." (*Const.* 8, 2.) Speaking of the loss of great gains planned and striven for: "From all these things the sage escapes who does not know how to live either with a view to hope nor to fear." (*Ib.* 9. 2.) "A mood free from concern is the specific property of the sage." (*Ib.* 13, 5.) "The sage knows that all these that stride along in toga and purple, men lusty of brawn and tanned by the sun, are not quite sound in mind, who in his eyes are merely ill and uncontrolled." (*Ib.* 13, 2.) Of course, he admits here and

there that this state of perfect wisdom is, alas! an unattainable ideal: "Do I say that I am a sage? By no means. For if I could claim that, not only would I deny that I was miserable [he was then to go into his Corsican exile], but I would vaunt it to every one that I was the most fortunate of mankind, and brought into the neighborhood of god." (*Helv.* 5, 2.) "Over and over again I must remind you that I am not speaking of the sages, to whom is welcome whatever is necessary, who have their soul in their control, and impose upon themselves whatever law they choose, and who keep the laws they have imposed, but of imperfect men." (*Benef.* 2, 18, 4.) "That proud promise, that the wise never regrets his action, nor ever revises what he has done, nor changes his design." (*Ib.* 4, 34, 3.) And finally this noble passage: "That is pleasure, not to fill and fatten the body, nor to stir the appetites, from which sleep is safest, but to be free from that unrest which the scheming of men quarreling with one another mightily shakes up, and that other form of unrest, which is outrageous, and comes to us from far-away tradition [the Homeric Olympus], when the legends of the gods had credence, and we rated them by the standard of our own faults. This pleasure, equable, fearless, sure never to feel any weariness of itself, *he* realizes whom we are depicting [the ideal sage], preeminently, so to speak, versed in divine and human law. He rejoices in that which is at hand; he hangs not on things which are to come, for no firmness has he whose bias is toward uncertain things." Socrates was, if I may so call it, the foremost among the Stoic saints of the past; for although the Attic sage antedated the Stoic sect by many years, they still claimed him as their own, as one who in a particular sense, and in a degree never surpassed, had in his life and death been an incarnation of what the Stoic sect held most dear. Not far from him stood the firm and fearless Roman, Caesar's unflinching foe, Cato of Utica; and while these heroes of freedom are again and again extolled and brought into play as living examples of Stoic doctrine, Seneca is outspoken in his aversion for autocrats as the archenemies

of human freedom. And when we stop to consider that from Caligula to Nero Seneca was the foremost man of letters in the Roman Empire, we marvel not a little at the fact that he lived as long as he did, and that he wrote what he did. As regards the Emperor Caligula, Seneca was perhaps not quite free from a personal grudge against him. He tells us how that tyrant threatened the sky because it interfered with a pantomime show (*De Ira* 1, 20), of his exquisite cruelty (*ib.* 2, 33, 3), his amusement with scenes of torture (*ib.* 3, 18, 3). And between this predecessor and maternal uncle of Nero there existed more than one band of affinity. It is not only Marius and Sulla the puffed-up Xerxes and the mad Cambyses, not only Phalaris and Dionysius, the Sicilian tyrants, not only the Thirty Tyrants of Attic Annals, whose memory our philosopher of freedom reprobates. He entertained a keen dislike for Alexander of Macedon, and conquerors as such were keenly distasteful to him, and the Macedonian preeminently so, "from his boyhood a highway robber and a ravager of nations, destroyer of the enemy as well as his own friends" (*Ben.* 1, 13, 3). His killing of the philosopher Callisthenes is called "an indictment that will go down through the ages" (*crimen aeternum*, *Nat. Q.* 6, 23, 2. 3). In fact, Seneca exhausts his vocabulary of moral condemnation in dealing with the Macedonian.

Turn we now, in concluding these readings, to the death of Seneca. For death is often not only the most momentous part and conclusion of a man's life, but it places not rarely a lasting seal on the worth of his life, and is apt to have a conclusive force in determining the lasting estimate of men. How often in his brilliant and stirring essays has not Seneca told his generation that death belonged to the fortuitous things; that it was no evil; that the study of no theme was as necessary as this; that in the incalculable revolutions of human fortune it was the only certain thing; that it was the best device of nature; that it was the only harbor in a stormy sea; that it was as base to flee from death as to resort to death; that the foulest death was preferable to the most luxurious servitude. Once or twice he seems to have



aspired to the Platonic conception of a new life, as in *Ep.* 36, 10: "Et mors, quam pertimescimus ac recusamus, intermittit vitam, non eripet: veniet iterum qui nos in lucem reponat dies, quem multi recusarent, nisi oblitos reduceret. Sed postea diligentius docebo omnia, quae videntur perire, mutari." Thus he wrote in that last span of time which lay between his own retirement from power and his death.

That Seneca was named in the conspiracy we must not marvel when a chance meeting, joint attendance at a banquet, accompanying one to public games, had proved adequate cause for indictment and prosecution (Tacitus, *Ann.* 15, 58). The Roman historian does not believe (*ib.* 60) that the retired philosopher had been at all implicated in the plot, but the joy at reveling at will in any mood was always a motive welcome to this particular autocrat. Besides, it seems that Nero had, before this, intended to remove the old man by poison, secretly, but had failed. Seneca had, it seems, on the very date returned from Campania, and taken residence in a suburban villa four miles from the capital. He was dining with his wife Pompeia Paulina and two friends, when the villa was surrounded by praetorian troops, whose commanding officer entered, and put to Seneca certain questions based on the statements of an informer, Natalis. He readily disposed of the main charge, which was flimsy enough. As for the rest, he demeaned himself in his utterances of Nero's emissary with very positive freedom and fearlessness. He had no reason to prefer the welfare of a private person (Piso) to his own safety. His own character was not inclined to flattery, and no one was more aware of this than Nero, who had more frequently experienced freedom than servility at the hands of Seneca. The officer carried back this report to Rome. Nero at that time was in a state of chronic fury. He received the emissary's report in the presence of Tigellinus and the empress Poppaea, his chief counselors at the time. Nero asked the officer whether Seneca was preparing for a voluntary death. The reply was that there had been no symptoms whatever of fear or terror, no gloom in words or mien of

the former minister and counselor. The officer was ordered to return at once to the villa, and announce to Seneca that he must die. He returned, — he was a *tribunus militum*, of the social class of gentlemen, we would say, — but he felt a delicacy to appear before the philosopher himself and to speak to him these tidings, so he sent into the villa a centurion to deliver the emperor's judgment. Seneca asked for his testament, desiring to remember some of his friends by codicil; but the centurion said this could not be. If, then, Seneca went on, he could not leave his friends any material bequest, he still could leave them the only thing he had to leave, and still the fairest he had, *viz.*, the image of his life, and if they remembered that, they would win the reputation both of noble culture and of faithful friendship. At the same time he restrained their tears, now by quiet conversation, now by more emphatic insistence, and recalled them to firmness, asking them what had become of the precepts of philosophy, what of the theory pursued by the study of so many years. For who had not been aware of Nero's cruel character? Nor was there anything left after the slaying of his mother and brother than to add the death of his educator and teacher. It was almost like a lecture (62). He then embraced his wife, and urged her not to join him in death, but in the contemplation of his life virtuously spent to endure the yearning for her husband by honorable forms of consolation. But she insisted on sharing his fate. Both cut the veins of their wrists. But Seneca was old and his body enfeebled through slender food, and the circulation of the blood was sluggish in that enfeebled body; the blood consequently trickled out but slowly. Seneca, therefore, made incisions in the veins of his thighs and the hollow of his knees, and worn out by cruel suffering, lest by his own pain he might weaken his wife's spirit, and himself, by witnessing her pain, might be weakened to a point of non-endurance, urged her to withdraw to another chamber. Before the end came, the philosopher called in writers, we may assume that they were *notarii* or shorthand experts. These last utterances were, later on, published, and in Tacitus's time a familiar piece of literature. That was the end.

It cannot be my aim, it is no part of my task, to draw from these readings any commonplace appeal or any application for hearers and readers. All this period of history and letters is one where the rising Church of Christ and the declining and descending Greco-Roman world first come into touch. It is a great and a noble theme. In Seneca and his imperial pupil the world will always have an impressive and momentous lesson, whether the world is Christian or not. Seneca was almost canonized by Jerome, whose restless industry indeed rushed over enormous spaces, but whose accuracy and lack of sober judgment often is at fault. Philosophy could not then redeem, it could not even slightly touch or move that cesspool of evil and that dance of death which so largely was exemplified by the sovereign of the Mediterranean world. It cannot any more do now what it failed to do then. The soul needs, and indeed seeks, a redemption which no mere man can achieve for his weak and sinful brethren.

New York, N. Y.

E. G. SIHLER.

## "HOW OLD IS MAN?"

### THE NEANDERTHAL MAN.

Mr. Roosevelt discusses the Neanderthal man, next in line of "prehuman predecessors of ours," with a wealth of detail which argues close acquaintanceship. He writes: "These Neanderthal men were squat, burly, thick-skulled savages, with brows projecting over cavernous eyes, knees permanently bent, and jaws almost chinless. Their brains were of good size, but the portions which represented the higher intellectual attainments were poorly developed. . . . They were a low race of men, distinctly human, but far nearer the beast than any existing race." More detail is added regarding the fashioning of tools, their hunting-grounds, and cavern-life. Again we ask, What basis of fact underlies these confident assertions?

The Neanderthal skull was found in 1856 in the neighbor-



hood of Duesseldorf by Dr. Fuhlrott, of Elberfeld. When the skull and other parts of the skeleton were exhibited at a scientific meeting held at Bonn the same year, a wide divergence of opinion at once developed among the specialists. By some, doubts were expressed as to the human character of the remains. Others held that the remains indicate a person of much the same stature as a European of the present day, but with such an unusual thickness in some of them as betokened a being of very extraordinary strength. Dr. Meyer, of Bonn, regarded the skull as the remains of a Cossack killed in 1814! Other scientists agreed with him. Modern Science accepts the antiquity of the Neanderthal man, but the controversy has never ceased. Mr. Roosevelt admits that Darwin practically ignored this discovery, "though it was exactly the 'missing link' he hoped to find." The great Virchow declared the peculiarities of the bones to be the result of disease. Mr. Roosevelt chides Virchow for his "wrong-headed insistence, which delayed for a full generation the full understanding of its importance." However, when, following Osborne, Mr. Roosevelt terms the Neanderthal race "distinctly human," "human beings" (p. 125), he is not supported by Schwalbe, who in his standard work on the subject (*Der Neanderthalschaedel*, 1901) says that this species, though extremely ancient, is "distinctly not human"—"ist ausserhalb der Variationsbreite des Menschen,<sup>4)</sup> weil er eine groessere Anzahl von Merkmalen aufweist, die keine der ausgestorbenen oder jetzt lebenden Rassen des *Homo sapiens* besitzen. *Er ist eine besondere Art*," a distinct, independent species. In the article "Mensch" in Meyer's *Konversationslexikon* the man of Neanderthal and Krapina (referred to hereafter) is called a type quite divergent from recent man—"ein Typus, der von dem rezenten Menschen durchaus abweicht." An authority on organic evolution, Professor Cope, thinks that the Neanderthal specimens are *specifically* different from *Homo sapiens*, because the Neanderthal skull "has a smaller brain-cavity, a retreating forehead, and also a retreating chin." He thinks the Pithecanthropus of Du Bois "may go with *Homo*

4) "Beyond the range of the variability of the human type."

*Neanderthalensis*, though its chin is not known." 5) Here it should be stated that an entire group of scientists believe, on the evidence of the Piltdown skull, that the prehistoric race from which we are descended never became so bestial as the possessors of the skulls found at Neanderthal, at Spy in Belgium, and La Chapelle-aux-Saints in France are believed to have been, and that the latter belonged to a branch of the race which gradually degenerated, until it finally became extinct, while the other and superior branch kept on improving until man as we know him gradually developed.

However, the "bestial" character of the Neanderthal remains is by no means admitted on every hand. Near Liège, in Belgium, not more than seventy miles from the Neanderthal, the Engis skull was found. After careful measurements it was proved not to differ materially from skulls of modern Europeans. This fact should prevent us from making any assertions respecting the primitive character, in race or physical conformation, of these cave-dwellers. Indeed, Prof. Huxley, in a very careful and elaborate paper upon the Neanderthal and Engis skulls, places an average skull of a modern native of Australia about half-way between those of the Neanderthal and Engis caves. Yes, he says that, after going through a large collection of Australian skulls, he "found it possible to select from these crania two (connected by all sorts of intermediate gradations), the one of which should very nearly resemble the Engis skull, while the other would somewhat less closely approximate to the Neanderthal skull in size, form, and proportions." And yet, as regards blood, customs, or language, the natives of Southern and Western Australia are probably as pure as any race of savages in existence. In fact, it would,

---

5) In other words, Mr. Cope, unquestionably a man competent to speak on matters concerning speculative science, believes that the Pithecanthropus and the Neanderthal man might well have been coeval. According to Mr. Roosevelt's authorities, they were separated by a chasm of at least 350,000 years, "conservatively figured." How may any one speak with such assurance as Mr. Roosevelt when leading theorizers are so far apart in their estimates? (See Cope, *The Primary Factors of Organic Evolution*, Open Court Publishing Co., 1896.)

no doubt, be possible to find in Europe or America among persons of abnormal underdevelopment, such as idiots, skulls of a formation which would match that of the Neanderthal.<sup>6)</sup> "The Engis skull, perhaps the oldest known, is," according to Prof. Huxley, "a fair average skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher, or might have contained the thoughtless brain of a savage." In this opinion Mr. Huxley is supported by one of the greatest anthropologists of his time, Daniel G. Brinton, who says concerning the cave-men of France and Belgium: "Neither in stature, cranial capacity, nor in muscular development did these earliest members of the species differ more from those now living than do these among themselves. We have no grounds for assigning to these earliest known men an inferior brain or a lower intelligence than is seen among various savage tribes still in existence."<sup>7)</sup>

Confusion has become worse confounded since Prof. Gornjovic-Kramberger, of Agram, found the remains of ten pre-historic individuals in Krapina cave in Croatia, Austria. Professors Schwalbe and Klaatsch produced facts which "prove positively" that the Krapina skull is of a type much lower than the lowest human skull of to-day, and represents a creature separated from the man of to-day by a far greater difference than was the difference between him and the ape. Dr. Hagen writes: "Our organs of speech, particularly the tongue, are governed by a group of muscles which are fastened to a little double-pointed growth of bone on the inside of the chin. In the anthropoid ape, who lacks the power of articulate speech, we find a *groove* in that place instead of a growth of bone. That same groove we find in the man of Krapina." But there is still a difference of opinion concerning several very important points. The Belgian scientist Fraipont believed that the Krapina skeletons showed that this man could not walk upright, or at least did not walk upright habitually. Other scientists say that the study of the bones does not justify this

6) Keary, *The Dawn of History*, p. 8.

7) *Universal Encyclopaedia*, VII, p. 470.

opinion. The teeth of the skulls found at Krapina are of immense size, greater even than those of the ape, and in some respects differing from the dentation of modern man. These divergencies have convinced the scientists that, whatever the age of the Krapina specimens, *they do not constitute the "missing link" between the brutes and man.* "Their facial features were certainly animal-like, being even behind the ape in the absence of forehead and chin. The conclusion that this creature was not merely different from recent man in kind, but actually different in species, is unescapable."

#### HAS THE MISSING LINK BEEN FOUND?

In all this we note a truly formidable conflict of first-class authorities. Mr. Osborn, whom Mr. Roosevelt follows, pronounces the Neanderthal man "distinctly human," "human beings." Schwalbe, the greatest specialist in this field of research, says: "This species is distinctly outside the field of human variability; it is essentially a distinct species." In this, Schwalbe has the support of the professional evolutionist Cope. Yet Cope would have the Neanderthal man go with *Pithecanthropus*, whom Roosevelt makes 350,000 years ("conservatively figured") older than the Neanderthaler. Others hold that the latter is a degenerate type of man. Huxley says it resembles the skull of some Australians in size, form, and proportions, and in this he is supported by Brinton. Others again classify the Neanderthal remains with the Krapina specimens, which, however, differ in the immensely important factor of dentition from modern man, and must, by "inescapable conclusion," be regarded specimens of a creature radically different from recent man. How, in view of this clashing of opinions, can Mr. Roosevelt say that he is presenting a summary "of all that has been discovered and soundly determined"? He calls the Neanderthal man the "missing link." "Not our ancestor," "savages lower than any existing human type,"<sup>8)</sup> yet "exactly the missing link which

---

8) This in flat contradiction to the opinion of Huxley and Brinton, above quoted.



Darwin hoped to find" (p. 125). How does this square with contemporary scientific opinion? No one can read Mr. Roosevelt's article and escape the impression that not only one, but many missing links have been found. There is an outline of development from the *Pithecanthropus* through *Pitldown* and *Neanderthal* to the ancestors of *Homo sapiens*. Let us ask: What basis is there for the assumption that these missing links have been found, that the genealogy of man has been traced?

The unanimous opinion of evolutionistic science is that none of the remains found in so-called Tertiary deposits, in the Pliocene, or even in the Pleistocene strata of the Quaternary age, supply the missing link in the evolution of man from the brute. The fossil remains are either plainly related to the brute, as when the bony process in the lower jaw, which is necessary for the growth of a human tongue, is missing, or they are quite evidently the remains of men that differed in no essential from recent man, *Homo sapiens*. *The link that connects the two has not been found.* This is the verdict of science.

Dr. Beck says in *Der Naturmensch*, Vol. III, p. 53: "The presence of man in the Tertiary period is not sustained by the facts." Alfred Russell Wallace, cooriginator with Darwin of the "Darwinian theory," quotes Huxley as follows in his book *Darwinism*:<sup>9)</sup> "In conclusion I may say that the fossil-remains of man hitherto discovered do not seem to me to take us appreciably nearer to that lower pithecoïd form, by the modifications of which he has probably become what he is." "Certain California remains of Pliocene man," Wallace continues, "give no indication of a specially low form of man; and it remains an unsolved problem why no traces of the long line of man's ancestors, back to the remote period when he first branched off from the pithecoïd type, have yet been discovered." On another page Wallace again expresses his wonderment at the fact that there is a "complete absence of human or prehuman remains in all those deposits which have furnished in such rich abun-

9) 1889, p. 307.

dance the remains of other land-animals." (*Darwinism*, p. 309.) Wallace refers to the Pliocene period, the same age of which Mr. Roosevelt so confidently asserts that during this time "developed the primates, from which came the monkeys, the anthropoid apes, and finally the half-human predecessors of man himself." Where is the proof? The statement is unsupported by a shred of tangible evidence. Speaking of the oldest skulls, Wallace says: "What is still more extraordinary, the few remains yet known of prehistoric man do not indicate any material diminution in the size of the brain-case."<sup>10</sup> The latest finds substantiate this opinion. Mr. Roosevelt makes no reference to the human skeleton found in the African Pleistocene, the Oldoway man. This remarkable fossil was found in the Oldoway gulch in northern German East Africa, in 1913, by an expedition of the Geological Institute of the University of Berlin. The remains consist of a complete skeleton, which was found deeply imbedded in firm tufa. Unquestionably ancient as these remains are, — the bones are completely fossilized, — they have contained lamentably "few primitive characteristics," and hence have not been exploited in the interest of the evolutionary theory. A fragment of skull, a tooth, a thigh-bone, offer much more inviting fields to the evolutionist, since they permit his imagination to range without the restraint of fact. The Oldoway fossil, which is in every essential respect a normal human skeleton, possesses no special attractions for those who would represent man as a descendant of brutish ancestors.

Says Prof. Virchow<sup>11</sup>): "We seek in vain for the missing link. There exists a definite barrier separating man from the animal which has not yet been effaced — *heredity*, which transmits to children the faculties of the parents. We have never seen a monkey bring a man into the world, nor a man produce

10) This, as has been shown by the cubic measurements quoted above, applies even to the Javan specimen of Dr. Dubois.

11) Quoted by Fairhurst, *Organic Evolution Considered*; Standard Press, 1913.

a monkey. All men having a Simian appearance are simply pathological variants. It was generally believed a few years ago that there existed a few human races which still remained in the primitive inferior condition of their organization. But all these races have been objects of minute investigation, and we know that they have an organization like ours, often, indeed, superior to that of the supposed higher races. Thus the Eskimo head and the head of the Terra del Fuegians belong to the perfected types." "All the researches undertaken with the aim of finding continuity in progressive development have been without result. There exists no proanthrope, no man-monkey, and the 'connecting link' remains a phantom." Dr. Berndt, of Berlin, says in a recent contribution to a scientific journal: "Since Dr. Dubois's *Pithecanthropus erectus*, once so far famed, must without question now be excluded from the direct genealogy of man, at least of European man, we must admit that there is *no link* which really bridges the chasm between the manlike animals (as, *e. g.*, the living chimpanzee and the fossil *Pliopithecus*, the *Dryopithecus*, and others) and even the most primitive men (as, *e. g.*, the Australian of to-day or the prognathous of the Ice age, the Neanderthal or Heidelberg man)." <sup>12)</sup> It had been suggested by some that in the *Dryopithecus Darwini*, referred to by Dr. Berndt, a fossil ancestor of man had been found. However, also this hope of the evolutionists has been dashed. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says<sup>13)</sup>: "It has been suggested that it is clearly related to man, but this idea is discountenanced by the great relative length of the muzzle and the small space for the tongue." Thus every new find, upon investigation, proves the truth of Virchow's words: "We must really acknowledge that there is a complete absence of any fossil type of a lower stage in the development of man. Nay,

12) *Naturwissenschaftliche Rundschau der Chemikerzeitung*, April, 1914. This very recent testimony is interesting also for its assigning of true human characteristics (with Huxley, Brinton, Wallace) to so-called Pleistocene remains, such as the Neanderthaler, whom Mr. Roosevelt classes with the half-beasts.

13) Vol. XXII, p. 336.

if we gather together all the fossil men hitherto found, and put them parallel with those of the present time, we can decidedly pronounce that there are among living men a much greater proportion of individuals which show a relatively inferior type than there are among the fossils known up to this time. . . . Every positive progress which we have made in the region of prehistoric anthropology has removed us farther from the demonstration of this theory." Not one of these loudly heralded missing links has stood the test of scientific investigation, but has either been recognized as undoubtedly Simian in character or has been ranged by competent anthropologists with some existing human type. There is so far not a scintilla of evidence for the evolution of man from the beast, of which Mr. Roosevelt so glibly speaks: "The evolution of man from a strong and cunning brute into a being having dominion," etc.

According to the view adopted by Mr. Roosevelt, the Neanderthal race died out, and "these savages, lower than any existing type, were supplanted by the tall, finely built Cro-Magnon race of hunters, who . . . belonged to the same species of man that we do—*Homo sapiens*." He believes that an interval of at least 25,000 years separated the immigration of the Cro-Magnon race from the appearance of the Neanderthal race. Once more we ask, What are the ascertained facts which underlie these definite assertions?

So much is true that in certain caves in France the remains of an earlier race of inhabitants have been found, mixed with bones of land-animals now extinct. Also, on the walls of these caves and on stones and bones these cave-dwellers engraved with no mean skill outline drawings of bison, reindeer, mammoth, horses, and the like. Beyond these unquestioned facts we again move in a maze of contradictory opinion, of which the *National Geographic* article once more contains no hint. According to the article on Caves in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the skeletons found in these French caves are not the remains of the artists whose work was found in the same chambers; yet, according to Mr. Roosevelt's article, just this



is the case. It was at one time supposed that these cave-men had well-developed animal characteristics. This idea is now given up, and instead of assigning to them an age of 100,000 years, as did Schmerling and many others, most anthropologists are satisfied with a period of 12,000 to 15,000 years, though some remains found in French caves were regarded as no more than 4,000 years old by Spring and Buckland. Indeed, drawings of human features have recently been found in the cave of La Colombiere, which in no wise resemble the traditional cave-man physiognomy. They are described as follows: "The head is large, the forehead round and prominent, rising slightly obliquely. The face is long, and is distinctly projected forward; the chin is prominent, the nose long and very thick." When the drawings of animals made by these cave-dwellers are pronounced intensely realistic by all who have seen them, are we not permitted to conclude that the features of human beings portrayed in these caverns come close to the general appearance of men in that remote age? Yet the features described by Messrs. Mayet and Pissot (1913) can be duplicated a thousand times on a walk down Broadway. There is not a trace of the animal in the drawings which they show in facsimile.

Mr. Roosevelt refers especially to the Cro-Magnon man, and supplies an illustration showing him in his cave in the act of drawing a bison on the wall. The Cro-Magnon man is described in the article as a race of hunters, "who in intelligence evidently ranked high." Yet competent investigators have held that the Neanderthal man and the Heidelberg man, which Mr. Roosevelt classes with the brute-links in the descent of man, were of the same race as the French cave-dwellers. In his lectures on Nature and the Bible Dr. J. W. Dawson, the well-known geologist and principal of McGill University, classes the Cro-Magnon, the Engis, and the Neanderthal skulls as "Palaeocosmic skulls." Of the Cro-Magnon cave remains he says: "The brain-case is very long, more so than in ordinary modern skulls, and this length is accompanied with a great

breadth, so that the brain was of greater size than in average modern man; and the frontal region was large and well developed. In this respect this most ancient skull fails utterly to vindicate the expectations of those who would regard prehistoric men as approaching the apes. . . . The celebrated Engis skull, believed to have belonged to a contemporary of the mammoth, is also *precisely of the same type*, though less massive than that of Cro-Magnon; and lastly, even the somewhat degraded Neanderthal skull, though inferior in frontal development, is referable to the same long-headed style of man, in so far as can be judged from the portion that remains. Let it be observed that these skulls are probably the oldest known in the world, and they are *all referable to one race of men.*"<sup>14)</sup> This opinion of Dawson, who was an expert craniologist, surely outweighs that of an amateur, who merely sums up the theories of one group of scientists, and passes them off on the public as "soundly determined" fact. Indeed Quatrefages, the great French anthropologist, believes that the Cro-Magnon people were of the same stock as the large-limbed and shapely Kabyles (Berbers) of modern Mauritania! Virchow says: "The old troglodytes, pile-villagers, and bog-people prove to be quite respectable society. They have heads so large that many living people would be only too happy to possess them."<sup>15)</sup> And Le Conte cites the French authority on cave-men, M. Lartet, concerning the skeletons found in the Aurignac cave to this effect: "This was formerly a family or tribal burial-place; in the cave, along with the bodies, were placed funeral gifts in the form of trinkets and food; the funeral feast was cooked and eaten on the level space in front of the cave; carnivorous beasts gnawed the bones left on the spot. It is evident that the Aurignac men *practised religious rites which indicated a belief in immortality.*"<sup>16)</sup>

---

14) p. 171.

15) Quoted by Samuel Harris, *The Philosophical Basis of Theism*. Scribner's, 1892, p. 460.

16) *Elements of Geology*, p. 596.

## MAN AND THE PRIMATES.

It is evident that in answering the question, "How old is man?" Mr. Roosevelt has taken counsel with a naturalist who has adopted the most extreme opinions of modern scientists, and that he has represented much controverted subjects as if they were the assured results of science. It should be said, however, that in one point Mr. Roosevelt is in agreement with the consensus of modern theorizers on the antiquity of man: all hold that man is the product of an evolution extending over aeons of prehistoric time. We cannot leave this subject without briefly investigating the grounds upon which this assumption rests.

Mr. Roosevelt says: The mammals "developed along many different lines, including that of the primates, from which came the monkeys, and anthropoid apes, and finally the half-human predecessors of man himself." (p. 112.) Here again the distinguished writer adds to a doctrine generally held by scientists certain features which by no means reflect orthodox university belief of to-day. Let us concede that biologists are now nearly unanimous in the conclusion that there has been some kind of evolution; yet they are very doubtful as to its *rationale*, its causes, and the probable lines of phylogeny, or the "tree of life." No reputable scientist, be he geologist, palaeontologist, anthropologist, or biologist, would state the matter as Mr. Roosevelt states it, that "*from the primates came the monkeys, the anthropoid apes, and finally the half-human predecessors of man himself.*" True, Haeckel's *Natural History of Creation* contains a complete and circumstantial history of human ancestry in twenty-two stages of existence, from the unicellular Monera up to perfect Man. But Du Bois-Reymond many years ago declared Haeckel's genealogical tree (*Stammbaum*) to be "as authentic in the eyes of the trained naturalist as are the pedigrees of Homer's heroes in those of an historian." Thereby Du Bois-Reymond incurred the bitter and unappeasable wrath of Haeckel, yet there is no scientist to-day who does not, with Du Bois-

Reynond, as against Haeckel, reject the notion that animal forms as they are to-day can actually be traced through fossil ancestors to the original, simple cell.

We may go a step further. The best authorities are no longer unanimous in classifying man biologically with the order of Primates.<sup>17)</sup> Science gives increasing weight to the opinion

17) Mr. Roosevelt seems to distinguish the anthropoid apes, the monkeys, and man from the Primates. He refers to "the Primates, *from which came the monkeys*," etc. Now, "Primates" has in biological language always included monkeys, apes (*i. e.*, tailless monkeys), and man. Huxley divided the Primates into seven families, among them man being the first. Max Weber originated the classification: Anthropoid Primates, with suborders Simiæ (species: Man, apes, baboons, monkeys), and Prosimiæ (lemurs). Prof. Dorn, of Fort Wayne, informs us that neither Brehm's *Tierleben* nor the *Cambridge Natural History*, the greatest works on zoology in German and English, respectively, draw a distinction such as Mr. Roosevelt appears to draw, between Primates and the order which includes man and the apes, but use "Primate" as a class name for Lemuroidea and Anthroipoidea (monkeys, apes, man). Mr. Roosevelt's employment of the term "Primates" is so very unusual that we took occasion to make inquiry by letter. Under date of May 8, Mr. Roosevelt replied as follows: —

"MY DEAR SIR, —

"That sentence seems to me to be clear. At any rate, what I meant was that one of the original mammalian lines was that of the Primates, which originally consisted of low lemuroid forms. From the original stem the monkeys broke off at some date when the anthropoid apes and the predecessors of man were still part of the same stem. Then this second stem divided, the anthropoid apes splitting from the branch which led to the half-human predecessors of man. In other words, I regard these half-human predecessors of man not as descendants from the anthropoid apes, but both as descended from remote ancestors, who had split off from the monkeys; all, of course, tracing back to the early Primates. Of course, the order of Primates includes all of them alike. If you turn to Professor Osborn's book, you will see the matter gone over in some detail.

"Sincerely yours,

"THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

This statement clears up the reference to Primates earlier than man and the monkey; these Primates "originally consisted of low lemuroid forms." This was the opinion held fifteen years ago. If anything has been definitely established since that time, it is the fact that the fossil remains once depended upon supply no evidence for this hypothesis. No direct line leading from man to extinct lemurs has been traced. See the opinions of Cope and Hubrecht hereafter quoted.



that man is not a member of the same order of creatures as the monkey and the ape. *Homo sapiens* is being differentiated from the order of Primates, even as the bat, which Linné classified as a Primate, was differentiated long ago. The differences which have greatly impressed all who have given the matter special consideration are (aside from the intellectual superiority of man) the peculiarities of the human walk and his unique dentition. Prof. Dana, the greatest palaeontologist our country has produced, says in the final edition of his *Manual of Geology*, p. 1017: "Man stands in the successional line of the Quadrumana, at the head of the Animal Kingdom. But he is not a Primate among Primates. The Quadrumana (apes) are Brute Mammals, as is manifested in their Carnivore-like canines and their powerful jaws; in their powerful muscular development; in their walking on all fours; and the adaptation thereto exhibited in the vertebrae, producing the convexity of the back; and also in other parts of the skeleton. Man, on the contrary, is not Quadrumanous.<sup>18)</sup> His limbs are of the primitive type so common in the Eocene. He is plantigrade," has neither hoofs nor claws to his five toes, but something between the two. "Moreover, in his teeth 'Man is thoroughly primitive, he having in fact the original quadrituberculate form of molar, with but little modification.' . . . All these low-grade characteristics and despecialized conditions of the structure evince that man does not pertain zoologically to the group called

---

18) We have traveled a long way since Dr. Moscati taught that the upright walk of man is a cause of much inconvenience and disease, proving that he was misled by reason and imitation to deviate from the first animal arrangement. Thus, for example, if man had continued to walk on all fours, his intestines would not have come into their present "pendulous and half reversed condition," which is a cause of "deformities and numerous diseases." Again, "the heart, because it is compelled to hang free, elongates the blood-vessels to which it is attached, assumes an oblique position, since it is supported by the diaphragm, and slides with its end against the left side—a position wherein man differs from all other animals, and thereby receives an inevitable inclination to aneurism, palpitation, asthma, chest-dropsy, etc., etc." Thus it is proven that man is really by nature intended to be and originally undoubtedly was quadrupedal! (Quoted in *Kant and Spencer*, by Dr. Paul Carus, p. 44.)

Primates, either to the higher or lower end of the series. The divergence from the *Quadrumanus* is manifestly great." These divergencies, says Dana, p. 1036, "are *admitted proof that he has not descended from any existing type of Ape*. In addition, Man's erect posture makes the gap a very broad one. The search for 'missing links' has been carried forward with deep interest during recent years. But although fossil skeletons have been found among remains of the Pleistocene Mammals in Europe and America, none show any departure from the erect posture, or have smaller brain cavity than occurs among existing races of men. . . . Since Man's structural relations are, in several respects, closest with the precursors of the *Quadrumanus*," *i. e.*, with fossil specimens which are, geologically, "earlier" than the monkeys and apes, "his derivation from *any known type of man-ape has been pronounced impossible*." The reader will observe that this opinion of the dean of American palaeontologists flatly contradicts the primate or ape ancestorship which Mr. Roosevelt with such *insouciance* summarizes in the introduction to his paper.

Agassiz says, simply: "Man does not descend from the mammals which preceded him in the Tertiary age." Nor is this merely the view of an old-school geologist, but is the regnant opinion among scientists to-day. The structural differences between man and the modern ape are held to be absolutely insuperable. All "other" Primates have a tendency to the elongation of the canine teeth. All apes support themselves on the sides of the feet, and the bent knuckles of the hand.<sup>19)</sup> They are, as Dana says, not plantigrade. Geologically speaking, the characteristics of man's teeth and of his walk are "more ancient," less "developed," than the dentition and walk of the Primates. In addition, Mr. Tylor is constrained to say, in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (II, 110): "The differences between a gorilla's skull and man's are truly immense." He quotes Huxley: "On psychological grounds Huxley acknowledged an immeasurable and practically infinite diver-

19) *Encycl. Brit.*, II, 109.

gence, ending in the present enormous psychological gulf between ape and man."

Thus, aside from the great disparity between the intellect of man and of the ape, the laws of development which are generally applied in establishing degrees of relationship in the plan (or "tree") of life have been seen to militate against ranging man with any existing animal, and the idea that man has living ancestors among the apes and monkeys is definitely given up. And this is truly an amazing fact. Far from establishing a close relationship between man and the ape, scientific research has established the fact that there is not only among existing species, but *even in the fossil remains not a single specimen which can properly be called a link in the chain of man's descent.*<sup>20)</sup> So far as man is concerned, the development of which Mr. Roosevelt speaks, from "small warm-blooded beasts to the Primates," etc., is mere hypothesis. There is not only *one* missing link (*viz.*, the one between ape and man), but the entire genealogy of man is made up of missing links, in other words, is speculation pure and simple.

Reputable scientists, who should be carefully distinguished from irresponsible amateurs who have no ballast of *information* to keep them on an even keel, make no secret of this disheartening fact. Dr. Berndt, in the article from which we have already quoted, says: "Trees of life, apparently built for all ages, have fallen or have become mere *shrubs* of life (*Stammbuesche*), covered with a tangle of scientific doubt." "We are farther than ever removed from the answer to the question, Whence the vertebrates?" Animals once confidently termed "primitive" are now recognized as high in the scale of development. "And Max Weber, one of the best authorities on mammals, regards the anthropoid apes of to-day as a branch parallel to the human branch. Scholars like Cope, Adloeff, Klaatsch, prefer to push the origin of man back to the earliest Eocene, whence he *went his way from the very outset separate from the apes.*" This is a highly significant utterance. It

20) See quotations from Wallace, above, also Virchow.

means nothing more than this: there is not one recognizable link which unites man with the animal kingdom. All the intermediate forms between man and the original jelly-fish, which according to Haeckel and Vogt was his ancestor, have disappeared. For their existence we have nothing but the word of a rapidly diminishing number of scientists.

The truth is that the tree of life looks less and less like a tree, the farther research traces out in fossil remains the actual history of life. About 1890, Mr. Topinard still told us that the common origin of man and the anthropoid apes is to be found in an animal of the type of the Old World monkeys, while all monkeys in turn find a common root in a type like that of the lemurs. It became somewhat different when Prof. Cope suggested that advancing knowledge led to the belief that the Anthropomorpha (*i. e.*, man and the anthropoid apes) are not derived from the monkeys, but the two branches run back *independently* to find their first connection in the lemurs, the common ancestor of both; not, however, he added, in any existing type of lemur, but in extinct types of the Eocene period, that is to say, of the oldest geological period in which traces of animal life appear. This, again, is simply saying that there is no palaeontological evidence for a tree of life with connecting links between man and the brutes.

The truly amazing fact that the various forms of life appear not more, but less related, the farther the evidence is being looked into, is admitted in every up-to-date text-book of palaeontology or geology. Dana says in his great work, in a discussion of the development of life on the globe: “The lines of succession seldom connect the grander divisions of classes or tribes. . . . Instead of lines from Amphibians to Reptiles, and thence to Birds or to Mammals, all three groups, Reptiles, Birds, and Mammals, were probably derived directly from the Amphibians.” (*Manual of Geology*, p. 1031.) Hence anthropologists were for decades much divided on the question whether the different races of men have had a common or a separate origin. Dr. S. G. Morton thought he could point out twenty-



two centers in which the human race originated. The majority now believe that man originated in some *one* locality, and from a single pair. The origin of this pair, however, is shrouded in Cimmerian night. Only so much is pretty well agreed that no animal now living supplied the species from which modern man has "developed." As we have noted, a feeble attempt has been made to trace man through a side-line of the Primates, through the monkeys called lemurs, *Lemuridae*. These are a species of woolly-haired monkeys, about the size of a cat, with long, bushy tails and foxlike faces. They do not distantly resemble a human being, but have several structural similarities in common with man. An Eocene fossil has been found, the earliest known four-handed creature, called *Anaptomorphus homunculus*. The Neo-Lamarckian E. D. Cope traced the pedigree of man through the anthropoid apes to this minute animal, which he regarded as a lemur. (An illustration in Dana's *Manual*, p. 906, shows the skull of this creature to have been *one inch* in diameter.) But this identification is now pretty well relinquished by the evolutionists. Only five years ago Professor A. A. W. Hubrecht, of Utrecht University, "conclusively" showed that *Anaptomorphus* belongs not to the lemurs, but to a line of its own approaching the Anthropoid apes, and sharply separated from the Lemurs.<sup>21)</sup> This again

---

21) *The Descent of the Primates*. Scribner's, 1897. Prof. Hubrecht suggests that it may not be unwise to assume as the ancestor of man and the anthropoids an early Eocene Primate, differing from the apes, whose descent must be traced back *independently of the ancestors of the modern apes* to the amphibian father of all. It has been pertinently said that this "tree of life" "will soon begin to look amazingly like a plantation of canes, each growing independently from a common soil" (*The Presbyterian and Reformed Review*, 1898, p. 782), in other words, will resemble very closely the tree of life suggested by Genesis, chapter I. Prof. Hubrecht says: "The genera known to us very rarely converge toward known predecessors as we go backward in geological time," *i. e.*, there is no evidence of development according to the lines of the evolutionary theory; "their respective genealogies run much more parallel to each other, the point of meeting being thus continually transported backward toward yet older geological strata." (*The Descent of the Primates*, pp. 39. 40.) Viewing this endeavor of the evolutionists to lay down new

signifies that whilst the Eocene Anaptomorphus, to quote Mr. Cope, "strongly suggests a line of descent leading to man, the gap is much wider than men used to regard it, and the intermediate links are still missing." Such retrogression in the claims of "assured results" should make all amateurs careful. All dogmatic assertion — and in this Mr. Roosevelt's article abounds — is out of place where the leaders in scientific research are admittedly at sea. The caution uttered by Charles Darwin in his *Origin of Species* is still in place; he says that in our present state of knowledge it seems to him "about as rash to dogmatize on the succession of organic forms throughout the world as it would be for a naturalist to land for five minutes on some barren point in Australia, and then to discuss the number and range of its productions."

Anthropological research has produced no FACTS that are at variance with Genesis, chapter one. Concerning the Neanderthaler, the Cro-Magnon man, etc., Dr. Dawson has said: "Geological evidence resolves itself into a calculation of the rate of erosion of river valleys, of deposition of gravel and cave-earths, and of formation of stalagmite crusts, all of which are so variable and uncertain that, though it may be said that an impression of great antiquity beyond the time of received history has been left on the minds of geologists, no absolute antiquity has been proved; and while some, on such evidence, would stretch the antiquity of man to even half a million years, the oldest of these remains may, after all, not exceed our traditional six thousand."<sup>22</sup> "These skeletons . . . tell us that primitive man had the same high cerebral organization which he possesses now, and we may infer the same high intellectual and moral nature, fitting him for communication with God and headship over the lower world."<sup>23</sup>

---

hypothetical lines of descent here, there, and everywhere, rather than to ask seriously whether any such really exist in nature, one is tempted to suspect that, if writers of this kind did not put "evolution" into their premises, they would hardly find so much in their conclusions.

22) *Nature and the Bible*, p. 160.

23) *Ibid.*, p. 175.

Similarly Figuiet held that "we know of no archaeological find [stone hatchets, etc.] that could not be pronounced only five thousand years old as well as fifty thousand." Scientific research has not yet produced any evidence to controvert the maxim of the great Linné: "*Species tot sunt, quot diversas formas ab initio produxit Infinitum Ens.*"

TH. GRAEBNER.

## MISCELLANY.

TO THE NATION (December 17, 1914) we are indebted to the following:

### MARTIN LUTHER AND ENGLAND.

An extremely rare book, found in the Bodleian, but not in the British Museum, is "M. Luther's Sermon on the Keys and of Absolution on John xx. 21, 22, translated by R. Argentine. Ipswich. 1548." The name of the translator as here given is a pseudonym, the last word, "Argentine," meaning simply "of Strassburg," which in Latin is known as Argentina or Argentoratum. The problem is, then, to find an Englishman one of whose names begins with R, and who lived for some time at Strassburg. The last name that occurred to me was that of Friar Roy, Tyndale's helper and a translator of other Lutheran works into English. He lived long in Germany, and spent some time at Strassburg, but, as he disappears from sight in 1532, and as Thomas More relates that he fell a victim to the Portuguese inquisition in that year, the present translation could not have been by him unless it was a reprint of an earlier work now unknown. This is so improbable as to make further search desirable. I now think that the translator was Richard Hilles, an English Protestant clergyman, who spent several years at Strassburg with Bucer. By contemporary letters he can be traced there in 1546, and from December 8, 1547, to August 22, 1548. As he set out for England on this date, nothing is more likely than that he carried with him a version of Luther's sermon, to be printed immediately on his arrival. By his friends he is often referred to by his first name only, and there is nothing strange in his taking the initial R rather than H in finding a *nom de plume*.

In the very same year Walter Lynne, a London printer, himself translated, published, and dedicated to the Princess Elizabeth another of Luther's works, namely:—

A frutefull and godly Exposition and declaration of the kyngdom of Christ and of chrysten lybertye made upon the words of the Prophete Jeremye in the xviii chapter, with an exposycyon of the viii Psalme, intreating of the same mater by the famous clerke Doctor Martyn Luther, whereunto is annexed a Godly sermon of Doctor Urbanus Rhegius upon the ix Chappter of Mathews. . . . Translated out of the hyghe Almayne. Gwalter Lynne. London. 1548.

In the following year Lynne published another of Luther's writings under the title:—

A briefe collection of all such textes of the scripture as do declare the most blessed and happie estate of them that be with sycknes. . . . Whereunto are added two fruitfull and comfortable sermons made by the famous clarke doctor Martin Luther. . . . G. Lynne. 1549.

No more English versions of the Reformer's works were printed during the reign of Edward VI, and only one during the reign of Mary. This was from Luther's *Vom Greuel der Stillmesse*:

A sermon of the great blasphemy agynst God whych the Papystes do use reading this Antechrystian Canon in theyr Mass.

No date, place, or name of printer is given. The British Museum catalog places it in the year 1554, and the appropriateness of its subject to the reign of the Catholic queen is obvious. It may have been printed on the Continent, as was Tyndale's New Testament and many of his works. Even under the Protestant Edward, in 1550, an Oxford scholar, Francis Dryander, though of the Reformed faith, went to Basel to get books printed.

An estimate of the influence of Luther's writings in England in the sixteenth century must note that they furnished the originals for the translation of the English Bible, for many hymns, and for the Thirty-nine Articles. It is a well-known fact that the first complete English Bible (1535) frankly stated on its title-page that it was "faithfully translated out of Douche and Latyn," the Dutch being, of course, Luther's German. Comparison of the texts amply bears out the fact that both Tyndale and Coverdale leaned very heavily on the Reformer. On the other hand, the assertion that Tyndale was at Wittenberg and knew Luther personally, though made by his contemporaries Edward Lee, Thomas More, and Cochlaeus, and repeated by Froude, Demaus, Momfret, Gairdner, and many others, is, in my judgment, certainly false. Not only is there no mention of this visit in the records of the University of Wittenberg, or in the voluminous correspondence of Luther, or Mēlanchthon, or Jonas, or Bugenhagen, or any other resident of the city, not only is there no mention of ever seeing Luther in all Tyndale's writings, but we have



his own denial: "when he [More] saith Tyndale was confederate with Luther, that is not the truth."

Some time before 1539 (the date is given by a list of prohibited books drawn up in that year) Miles Coverdale published "Ghostly Psalms and Spiritual Songs, drawn out of the holy Scripture." Mr. Herford has already noticed that some of these hymns were also drawn from Luther. Having made a more thorough study of the subject, I have noted the following parallels:

*German: Erlangen Edition of Luther's Works, Vol. 56.*

*English: Remains of Miles Coverdale, 1846.*

Nun freut euch, p. 309.  
 Psalm xii, p. 311.  
 Psalm xiv, p. 312.  
 Psalm cxxx (shorter form), p. 313.  
 Psalm lxvii, p. 318.  
 Lobgesang auf dem Osterfest, p. 319.  
 Ostergesang, p. 321.  
 Ten Commandments, p. 322.  
 Another Ten Commandments, p. 324.  
 Komm, Heiliger Geist, p. 330.  
 Lobgesang Simeons, p. 331.  
 Glaube, p. 333.  
 Psalm cxxviii, p. 335.  
 Psalm cxxiv, p. 336.  
 Lobgesang, p. 337.  
 Media vita, p. 338.  
 Ein Feste Burg, p. 343.

Be glad now, p. 555.  
 Do., p. 567.  
 Do., p. 581.  
 Do., p. 577.  
 Do., p. 580.  
 Easter Song, p. 563.  
 Another Easter Song, p. 563.  
 Do., p. 544.  
 Do., p. 545.  
 Come, Holy Spirit, p. 542.  
 Nunc Dimittis, p. 566.  
 Creed, p. 546.  
 Do., p. 573.  
 Do., p. 571.  
 Of the Holy Ghost, p. 566.  
 Media vita, p. 554.  
 Deus refugium, p. 569.

For the sake of comparison the first verse of the last-mentioned poem may be given:—

Our God is a defence and toure,  
 A good armour and good weapen,  
 He hath been ever our helpe and  
     sucoure  
 In all the troubles that we have  
     been in.  
 Therefore wyl we never drede  
 For any wondrous dede  
 By water or by londe  
 In hilles or the see sonde  
 Our God hath them all in his  
     honde.

Ain feste burg ist unser Gott,  
 ain gutte wör un waffen,  
 Er hilfft uns frey aus aller not,  
 Die uns yetzt hat betroffen.  
 Der alt böse feynd,  
 Mitt ernst ers yetzt meint,  
 gross macht un vil list  
 sein grausam rüstung ist,  
 auff erd ist nicht seins gleichen.

Though the wording of the two is not very close, the identity of the meter, save in the rhyme of the last line, makes it certain that Coverdale used the famous German hymn.

It is not generally known, and would hardly be agreeable for the "Catholic" party in the Episcopal Church to learn, that Luther had a finger in the Thirty-nine Articles. Such, however, is the case. When Henry VIII's ambassadors, Foxe, Bishop of Hereford, and Nicholas Heath, visited Wittenberg in 1536, they brought back with

them a set of seventeen articles, drafted by Melanchthon and approved by Luther, largely founded on the Augsburg Confession. Two years later, at a conference of the German ambassadors, Boineburg and Myconius, with English divines in London, these were digested into thirteen articles, which became the basis of the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI, and thus of the Thirty-nine Articles of Elizabeth. (Cf. G. Mentz: *Die Wittenberger Artikel von 1536*. Leipzig. 1905.)

Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

PRESERVED SMITH.

## BOOK REVIEW.

*Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:—*

1. *UNSER HEILAND*. Predigten ueber die altkirchlichen Evangelien des Kirchenjahres von *J. H. Hartenberger*. VIII and 431 pages. \$2.20.

The fields of the old pericopes have been so often harvested by homiletical reapers in our Church that their productiveness would seem to have been exhausted long ago. But they are found to be virgin soil by every new husbandman who comes to till them with prayer and study. Like every other word of God they never cease yielding seed to the sower and bread to the eater. Besides, the individuality of the reaper, his method of binding his sheaves and offering them, not only as messages from the Lord, but also as testimonies of his personal faith, add a strong element of interest to every new collection of sermons on the Gospel pericopes. The distinguishing feature of the present collection lies in their remarkable simplicity. There is nothing labored in these efforts to grasp and set forth some leading truth of the text. Every treatise proceeds along correct lines of thought, and its parts and connections are as self-vindicative as the divine Word which has started them. The application is earnest and cordial, and evinces pastoral tact.—The book contains 71 sermons: 57 on the 57 possible Sundays of the church calendar and 14 for the greater festivals of the Church.

2. *LUTHERBUCH*. Von *Gustav Just*. Jubilaeumsausgabe. 100 pp. 28 cts.

This is a new edition of a deservedly popular compend of church history for Lutheran schoolchildren. It describes, in three chapters, the rise and spread of the Christian religion from the days of the apostles to the labors of Boniface in Germany. Chapters 4 and 5 are devoted to the papacy and futile efforts at a reformation prior to Luther. The life of Luther is told in chapters 6 to 18. Chap. 19 describes the fortunes of the Lutheran Church after the death of Luther down to modern times, and the concluding chapter relates how the Lutheran Church was planted in America. Only the leading facts of each historical period indicated are treated, and these briefly, but the narrative is lively and fascinating, and leaves a true picture of events in the readers' minds.

3. *DAILY PRAYERS*. Selected and Adapted by *C. Abbetmeyer*. 90 pages. 44 cts.

This manual of prayers for use by the family and the individual offers, in the first part, eight series of prayers for every morning and evening of the week and for the principal festivals of the church-year; in the second part, fourteen prayers for use in private devotions on stated occasions. We hail this collection as one of the best handbooks available in our circles.

4. *WILLIAM TYNDALE*. The Translator of the English Bible. *William Dallmann*. 84 pages. 28 cts.

The contents of this little volume and the relative significance of its publication are described by the publisher as follows: "The series of historical books which we began with the little volume *John Hus*, which received such unusually cordial reception by our trade, is now continued by the addition of another from the pen of the same author, the Rev. William Dallmann. Pastor Dallmann has been a prominent figure before the reading public of the Lutheran Church for nearly a generation. The vivid pictures his short, but comprehensive descriptions unfold, his trenchantly precise style of saying exactly what he wants to say, the lesson he points out with a few terse words, or leaves to the reader to infer,—all these have made Dallmann one of the most widely read English authors of the Lutheran Church. The present volume is a biographical sketch of Tyndale's life and work in England, Germany, and Holland, with an appreciative chapter on his influence. Tyndale was the chief author of the Authorized Version of the English Bible, and well deserves to be far better known in our circles than he is. This book is even more copiously illustrated than its predecessor in our series, in many instances with rare prints gathered by the author."

5. Doctrinal papers on *THE DELUGE* (German), by *Rev. R. T. Fehlau*, 12½ pages, and on *THE PRESENT-DAY MISSION OF THE CHURCH* (English), by *Rev. O. W. Wismar*, 26 pp., submitted before the Southern District Synod. 12 cts.
6. A doctrinal paper on *THE TEMPORAL SUPPORT OF MINISTERS* (German), by *Rev. H. Meyer*. 30 pages. 12 cts.
7. A doctrinal paper on *THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER VIEWED AS A WORK OF GOD* (German, concluded), by *Rev. F. C. Verwiebe*. 40 pages. 15 cts.
8. *THE LUTHERAN BEREА BIBLE CLASS*. Gratis.
9. *BEREA BIBLE CLASS LESSONS 1916—1917*. Edited by *Pastors A. Doerfler and L. Sieck*. 11 cts.

The former pamphlet describes the purpose and the organization of a Lutheran Berea Bible class; the latter gives the material for study during the current year: the life of Joshua and the parables of Jesus. As "guide-posts to study" and incentives to the pupils "to do personal work" these lessons deserve recommendation.



10. *CERTIFICATE OF ORDINATION.* 22 cts.

Printed with a dark-green border and a reproduction of Wehle's Luther in light green, over which the legend is printed in bold letters, this certificate is the most practically worded document, attesting the legal authority of a minister, that has come under our survey.

*Success Printing Co., St. Louis, Mo.,* has issued No. 15 of the well-known *SAENGERBOTE*.

*GERMAN FOR TWO YEARS.* By *William Sihler.* The Forms. Elements of Syntax. Material for Review. 500 Conversational Idioms. Helps to Memory. Decorah, Iowa. Published by the author. 205 pages. \$1.25.

Prof. Sihler has taught German at Luther College, Decorah, Iowa, for twenty years. The method pursued by him has been suggested by observing that "German children do not learn German by translating; they learn it by hearing and repeating German words and combinations of words." We believe that he is right in saying: "The feeling for a language cannot be acquired in any other way." Accordingly, the 72 "lessons" with which the book opens are to indicate to the teacher, or autodidact, the principles of grammar (etymology and syntax) which he is to apply in the corresponding 72 "exercises" which follow. "No translations are required. The correct way of using German is to have the pupils repeat the exercises so often both in writing and orally that the words themselves will suggest what is missing, the same as they do to a person who has learned the language in childhood." The next section of the book contains well-selected material for review, which is followed by 500 conversational idioms, grouped in 26 divisions. "Helps to Memory" and a sufficient "Word List" conclude the volume.

*Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, Ohio: —*

1. *THE EISENACH GOSPEL SELECTIONS.* Made Ready for Pulpit Work. By *R. C. H. Lenski.* Second edition, carefully revised. Two volumes bound in one; 719 and 480 pages. \$3.50.

The first edition of this work, which we noted in Vol. XV, p. 190 f., has been exhausted within the space of five years. This indicates that there is a demand for a work of this kind, and may invite other workmen into this field in which there is room for many. As in the former edition, so is the peculiar doctrinal position of the Ohio Synod conspicuous also in this edition for its absence, at least for its clear and pointed utterance.

2. *HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.* By *Rev. P. A. Peter.* 208 pages. 35 cts.

Utilizing the immense material stored up in *Seckendorf's Commentary*, *Meurer's Luther*, *Rein's Luther*, *Janus*, *Pope*, and *Council*, *Guericke's Church History*, *Ridpath's Cyclopædia of Universal History*, and pertinent articles in the *Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, the author has prepared a very readable popular treatise on the Reformation. He treats, first, the Necessity of the Reformation, pp. 9—31;



secondly, the Beginning of the Reformation (to the publication of Luther's Theses), pp. 32—82; thirdly, the Struggles and Conflicts of the Reformation (to the Diet of Augsburg), pp. 83—158; fourthly, the Labors and Victories of the Reformation, pp. 159—206.

*The Lutheran Church Review* for July is devoted to the coming quadricentennial of the Reformation. It abounds in information which all who are preparing for the celebration of the Lutheran jubilee next year cannot afford to pass by. Dr. Schmauk contributes two articles on "The Luther and Reformation Literature of the Last Fifty Years," and a "Discussion of Reformation Literature for the Quadricentennial"; Dr. Fry writes on "The Seventh Jubilee of the Reformation—Some Reminiscences." (The Jubilee referred to is that of 1867.) "The Luther Jubilee," by Dr. Spaeth; "Celebrations of the Reformation," by Dr. Jacobs; "Luther as a Preacher," by Dr. Steinhæuser; "Erasmus and Protestantism," by Prof. Barinck; "Claus Harms's Ninety-five Theses" (of 1875), translated by W. A. L., and unsigned articles on Luther Articles in the *Lutheran Church Review* 1882—1916; Reformation Articles in the *Lutheran Church Review* 1882—1916; Luther and Reformation Articles in *The Evangelical Review* 1849—1870; Reformation Articles in the *Lutheran Cyclopaedia*; Reformation Literature Recommended by the Quadricentennial Office, constitute the remainder of the contents.

*Lutheran Board of Publication, Columbia, S. C.:—*

**SOME COUNTERFEIT RELIGIONS.** By F. C. Longaker, Ph. D.  
38 pages. 10 cts.

Spiritism, Russellism, Eddyism, Mormonisms, and Socialism are the five counterfeits discussed in this pamphlet. The discussions are brief and spirited, but they are sufficient.

**HOLIDAY OR HOLY DAY?** By Rev. Geo. U. Wenner, D. D.  
12 pages.

The author knows the Lutheran teaching on Sunday; he rightly identifies it with the teaching of the apostles, and distinguishes it from the Sabbatarianism of the Middle Ages and the Westminster Confession. He is right, again, in deprecating the Sunday desecration prevalent in our age. He is right, a third time, in declaring that Church and State must be kept separate, and hence Sunday legislation, even in a limited extent, must always be questionable. But he is wrong in claiming: "This is a Christian country"; "Christianity is the common law of the land." With this claim the author spills much of the good contents which he had gathered into his pamphlet. If "country" means the same as population, ours is decidedly not Christian by any reliable census report. If "country" is= government, this government was erected on absolutely non-religious lines. If our "country" wants "a civil Sabbath," it may decree one any time, and it need not be the first day of the week. But such an ordinance will not be a religious one. May the day be far distant when American Christianity looks to the civil magistrates to enforce any sort of Sunday observation!

D.